

# The Review of English Studies

*A Quarterly Journal of  
English Literature and the English Language*

**Editors:** PETER ALEXANDER, NORMAN DAVIS

---

## CONTENTS

Temperance and the Seven Deadly Sins in <i>The Faerie Queene</i> , Book II. By Robert C. Fox . . . . .	1
Thomas Nashe, Robert Cotton the Antiquary, and <i>The Terrors of the Night</i> . By C. G. Harlow . . . . .	7
John Tillotson's Revisions and Dryden's 'Talent for English Prose'. By David D. Brown . . . . .	24
Shelley and Jane Williams. By G. M. Matthews . . . . .	40

## NOTES

The Cartography of 'The Definition of Love' (Dean Morgan Schmitter and Pierre Legouis) . . . . .	49
Wordsworth's Vaudracour and Wilkinson's <i>The Wanderer</i> (Chester L. Shaver) . . . . .	55

(Continued at foot of next page)

---

OXFORD · AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

Single number: 14/- net; Subscription for four consecutive numbers: 45/-

# The Review of English Studies

**Advisory Panel:** H. S. BENNETT; JOHN BUTT; H. B. CHARLTON; SIR IPOR EVANS; EDITH J. MORLEY; ALLARDYCE NICOLL; PERCY SIMPSON; KENNETH SIMAM; D. NICHOL SMITH; JAMES R. SUTHERLAND; ALICE WALKER; DOROTHY WHITELOCK; F. P. WILSON; J. DOVER WILSON; C. L. WRENN.

MSS. offered for publication, correspondence on the subject-matter of the Journal, and books for review should be addressed to The Editors, *The Review of English Studies*, c/o The Clarendon Press, Oxford. MSS. cannot be returned unless postage is enclosed. Authors of articles printed will be entitled to 25 free offprints and may buy additional copies if application is made to the Editor when returning corrected proofs.

All other correspondence should be addressed to the Publishers, Oxford University Press, Amen House, Warwick Square, London, E.C. 4.

## CONTENTS (continued)

### REVIEWS, ETC.

Old English Prudentius Glosses at Boulogne-sur-mer, edited by Herbert Dean Meritt, 58; The Advent Lyrics of the Exeter Book, edited by Jackson J. Campbell, 59; Die 'Institutes of Polity, Civil and Ecclesiastical': ein Werk Erzbischof Wulfstans von York, edited by Karl Jost, 61; Arthurian Literature in the Middle Ages, edited by Roger Sherman Loomis, 66; The Parlement of the Thre Ages, edited by M. Y. Offord, 69; Chaucer and the French Tradition, by Charles Muscatine, 70; MS. Bodley 959: Genesis-Baruch 3.20 in the Earlier Version of the Wycliffite Bible. Vol. I, Genesis and Exodus, edited by Conrad Lindberg, 71; The Praise of Pleasure. Philosophy, Education, and Communism in More's *Utopia*, by Edward Surtz, S.J., 72; The Professional Writer in Elizabethan England. A Study of Non-dramatic Literature, by Edwin Haviland Miller, 73; Divine Poetry and Drama in Sixteenth Century England, by Lily B. Campbell, 75; The Spanish Tragedy, by Thomas Kyd, edited by Philip Edwards, 77; Shakespeare's Festive Comedy. A Study of Dramatic Form and its Relation to Social Custom, by C. L. Barber, 78; Troilus and Cressida, edited by J. Dover Wilson and Alice Walker, The Life of Timon of Athens, edited by J. Dover Wilson and J. C. Maxwell, 80; The First Modern Comedies, by Norman H. Holland, 83; English Literature in the Early Eighteenth Century 1700-1740, by Bonamy Dobrée, 84; Daniel Defoe. Citizen of the Modern World, by J. R. Moore, 86; Poems of Jonathan Swift, edited by Joseph Horrell, Poems of Charles Cotton, edited by John Buxton, 88; Mountain Gloom and Mountain Glory. The Development of the Aesthetics of the Infinite, by Marjorie Hope Nicolson, 90; The Letters of John Keats 1814-1821, edited by Hyder Edward Rollins, 91; Coleridge. Critic of Society, by John Colmer, 93; Novelists on the Novel, by Miriam Allott, The Theory of the Novel in England 1850-1870, by Richard Stang, 95; The Novels of George Eliot, by Jerome Thale, 98; The Ethical Idealism of Matthew Arnold, by William Robbins, 99; Conrad the Novelist, by Albert J. Guerard, 100; The Third Voice. Modern British and American Verse Drama, by Denis Donoghue, 102; James Joyce, by Richard Ellmann, 104; Three Traditions of Moral Thought, by Dorothea Krook, 106; Short Notices, 107; Summary of Periodical Literature, 109; List of Publications Received, 113.

# THE DICKENSIAN

54th YEAR OF PUBLICATION

Devoted to the study of Dickens. Published by the Dickens  
Fellowship in January, May, and September

12s. 6d. per annum, post free

Specimen copy on request

'This is a monument if you like; the continued  
prosperity of this periodical is a finer testimony to  
the glory and honour of its subject than any bronze  
or marble could be.'

E. V. LUCAS

THE DICKENS HOUSE  
48 Doughty Street, London, W.C. 1

---

## HEFFER'S OF CAMBRIDGE

*Booksellers*

•

BRITISH  
AND AMERICAN  
EUROPEAN  
AND ORIENTAL  
NEW AND  
SECONDHAND

*Large and small collections bought*

•

W. HEFFER & SONS LTD.  
PETTY CURY - CAMBRIDGE

---

[1 front]

## Studies in Words

C. S. LEWIS

In his new book C. S. Lewis analyses a number of key words and distinguishes their uses at various times and by various authors. 'Its effect upon the reader is to make him feel that his basic mental equipment has undergone a thorough overhaul.' *THE TIMES*. 21s. net

## The Theatre of the London Fairs in the Eighteenth Century

SYBIL ROSENFELD

Miss Rosenfeld has investigated the plays performed at London fairs during the eighteenth century, and the stages and theatres used. Her work makes a scholarly addition and is a necessary supplement to existing theatrical histories of the period. 30s. net

## The Poet in the Poem

GEORGE T. WRIGHT

A discussion of the way a poet's personality and thought is reflected in his poems. The poets discussed are: Eliot, Yeats and Pound. *UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS*. 28s. net

## A Victorian Publisher

ROYAL A. GETTMANN

A study of various aspects of publishing in the nineteenth century, based on an examination of the Bentley papers. The topics treated include publicity, agreements with authors, balance sheets, the publisher's reader and the editor. 4 plates. 40s. net

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS



## TEMPERANCE AND THE SEVEN DEADLY SINS IN *THE FAERIE QUEENE*, BOOK II

By ROBERT C. FOX

THIS paper is to a considerable extent a development of the thesis presented in this journal several years ago by Mr. John Holloway.<sup>1</sup> According to Mr. Holloway, the system of the Seven Deadly Sins provides a basic structure for the second book of *The Faerie Queene*; after the first two cantos which are introductory, each Deadly Sin appears in its traditional order represented by one or several personifications: Pride by Braggadocchio in Canto iii, Envy by Furor and others in Canto iv, Wrath by Pyrochles in Canto v, Sloth by Phaedria and Cymochles in Canto vi, Avarice by Mammon in Canto vii, Gluttony by Tantalus also in Canto vii, and finally—after several intervening cantos devoted largely to the House of Alma—Lust by Acrasia in Canto xii. On the basis of my own researches into the background of the Deadly Sins as well as on the evidence adduced by Mr. Holloway, I believe that this thesis is fundamentally sound; however, I disagree with the interpretation of Tantalus and have an alternative to offer regarding Gluttony. In addition, I would go farther and maintain that the system of the Deadly Sins is likewise present in still another episode—that it acts as a framework for the hazards encountered by Guyon during his voyage across the sea to reach the Bower of Bliss. Finally, I would like to indicate how the concept of the Deadly Sins is harmonized with and subordinated to the concept of temperance which constitutes the stated theme of Book II.

### I

Mr. Holloway considers Tantalus in the Garden of Proserpine episode (vii. 58–60) as the representative of Gluttony in the total pattern of the Seven Deadly Sins that pervades Book II. Tantalus can certainly be regarded as a type of Gluttony, but difficulties arise when he is interpreted in this context. Unlike the other figures who are depicted as opponents of Guyon or as obstacles to his mission, Tantalus is passive and inert; he is discovered undergoing punishment for his particular sin rather than manifesting it as a temptation. We must look elsewhere for an active embodiment of Gluttony. Such a figure is Excess who stands at the entrance to the Bower of Bliss with a golden cup in one hand and a cluster of grapes in the other. She customarily offers to unwary passers-by wine squeezed from these grapes by her own hand—‘that so faire wine-press

<sup>1</sup> ‘The Seven Deadly Sins in *The Faerie Queene*, Book II’, *R.E.S.*, n.s. iii (1952), 13–18.

made the wine more sweet'—but with Guyon she is unsuccessful. He takes the cup and casts it to the ground, thus breaking it and spilling its contents. Excess is angered by this deed but allows Guyon to pass on. He arrives at the Bower of Bliss where he seizes Acrasia and her current lover, destroys the Bower, and returns to their former shape the earlier victims whom Acrasia has transformed to beasts. With his mission thus accomplished, Guyon reflects on what he has just seen, and on this note the book comes to an end.

Hence in the final canto of Book II Guyon encounters two women, rejects their blandishments, and destroys their works. This artistic balance is based on the mutual relationship of the vices represented by Excess and Acrasia. It must be remembered that temperance is the stated theme of Book II and that Guyon is the exemplar of this virtue. The victory over Acrasia and the destruction of her Bower has been traditionally interpreted as the victory of temperance over Lust. But Guyon would be incomplete as the knight of temperance if he did not also meet and overcome a representative of Gluttony, for in the classical sense temperance has as its object the control of the ingestive as well as of the sexual appetite. Such is the significance of Excess: she is the temptress to gluttonous excess and the complement to the lustful Acrasia; like her companion, she is vanquished by temperance.

The conjunction of Gluttony and Lust is also in accordance with the general pattern of the Seven Deadly Sins which is fused with the theme of temperance. St. Gregory the Great in his *Moralia* classified the *septem vitia principalia* into categories of spiritual or carnal according as they render pleasures to the soul or to the body, with Gluttony and Lust belonging to the latter category. He also emphasized the close relationship between the two by noting the proximity of the digestive to the sexual organs and thereby concluding that the pampering of the former serves to stimulate the latter.<sup>1</sup> This concept is represented allegorically by the respective positions of Excess and Acrasia. Excess stands at the threshold of the Bower of Bliss. By inducing the unwary to partake of her wine, she renders them more liable to be ensnared by Acrasia; Guyon, in rejecting her proffered gift, is more easily able to reject the advances of Acrasia. Earlier in Book II a similar allegory has the same purpose: Perissa, the mistress of Sansloy, eats and drinks to excess before giving way to sexual indulgence with her lover (ii. 36-37).

## II

But before reaching the Bower of Bliss for the final temptation and victory, Guyon must first sail through a sea full of perils. These perils are

<sup>1</sup> *Moralia in Job*, xxxi. 87-90.

moral in nature, the Seven Deadly Sins personified. First there is the Gulf of Greediness which the Boatman describes in terms of Gluttony:

That is the *Gulfe of Greedinesse*, they say  
That deepe engorgeth all this worldes pray:  
Which hauing swallowd vp excessiue,  
He soone in vomit vp againe doth lay,  
And belcheth forth his superfluity,  
That all the seas for feare do seeme away to fly. (xii. 3)

Opposite is the Rock of Reproach representing the other carnal sin of Lust. Here are strewn the wrecks of ships and the bodies of those who, having spent all their substance

In wanton ioyes, and lustes intemperate,  
Did afterwards make shipwracke violent,  
Both of their life, and fame for euer fowly blent. (xii. 7)

The Palmer then exhorts Guyon to regard the examples of 'lustfull luxurie and thriftlesse wast', those who formerly spent their 'looser daies in lewd delights' (xii. 9).

The party sails on and some islands are sighted; a damsel beckons them from the shore, and, when they continue on their way, she sets out after them in an oarless boat. Guyon is at the scene of an earlier adventure, for the islands are the Wandering Islands in the Idle Lake and the damsel is Phaedria. As in Canto vi, Phaedria continues in her role as a temptress to Sloth, again using her feminine charms in an attempt to dissuade Guyon from his mission and again failing to succeed.

The next hazard is the Quicksand of Unthriftihead in which a goodly ship is aground. The mariners and the merchants vainly strive to save from destruction the ship and her precious cargo. Across from the Quicksand is the Whirlpool of Decay into which many vessels have been drawn. The waters now whirl around like a restless wheel and covet the boat bearing Guyon and his party. Taken together, these two hazards suggest the two extremes of prodigality and miserliness that comprise the Deadly Sin of Avarice. The richly laden ship grounded by 'unthriftihead' is an appropriate symbol for prodigal excess. The Whirlpool, drawing down into its depths the vessels which venture too near, suggests the action of a miser in hiding his wealth; it is significant that the Whirlpool is said to 'covet' the boat now approaching. The Boatman must steer a careful course between the two hazards, just as in Canto vii Guyon must reject both miserliness and prodigality, symbolized respectively by Mammon's initial offer of simple wealth and his final offer of court luxury in the person of his daughter Philotime.

The party now hears the roaring waves which

as they enraged were,

Or wrathfull Neptune did them driue before

His whirling charet, for exceeding feare. (xii. 22)

From the descriptive adjective applied to Neptune and from the violence displayed by the sea-monsters in the stanzas that follow, it is clear that Wrath is the Deadly Sin presented in this scene. The thousands of sea-monsters—hideous, deformed, and dreadful—are enough to frighten Guyon, but the Palmer explains that they are but phantoms conjured up to drive them from their journey; with a motion of his magic wand he dispels them.

Next is heard a 'ruefull cry' of one that 'wayld and pittifully wept, | That through the sea the resounding plaints did fly' (xii. 27). The source of this cry is a 'seemely Maiden' who, in great sorrow and agony, calls to them for succour. Guyon's impulse is to go to her aid, but the Palmer explains that the Doleful Maid is merely making a pretence to gain the knight's sympathy; should he succumb, she would bring about his ruin by injecting her 'guilefull bayt' into his mind (xii. 29). Guyon is satisfied with the Palmer's explanation, and the Boatman holds fast to his course. The Doleful Maid is depicted in terms traditionally used for personifications of Envy. The tradition goes back to Ovid who, in the second book of the *Metamorphoses*, portrayed both the hag Invidia and her victim Aglauros as women weeping bitterly at the sight of others enjoying happiness. The personified Envy in *The Romance of the Rose* (ll. 247-300 in Chaucer's version) is but one of the many portrayals based ultimately on Ovid. Elsewhere in *The Faerie Queene* Spenser depicted personifications of Envy along these lines. In Book v there is the hag Envy who grieves incessantly and grudges all that seems praiseworthy (v. xii. 30-32). In Book I, where the situation calls for a male figure, Envy is one of Lucifer's six evil counsellors. In the procession he weeps at the sight of the gold possessed by his neighbour Avarice, but he is likewise grieved at the sight of all good things—good works, virtuous deeds, and poetic fame—although it is explained that 'the cause of weeping he had none' (I. iv. 30-32). In a similar vein, the Palmer informs Guyon that the Doleful Maid has no reason for her grief.

A group of mermaids constitute the final hazard; these were once fair women until

they fondly striu'd

With th' *Heliconian* maids for maistery;

Of whom they ouer-comen, were depriu'd

Of their proud beautie, and th' one moyity

Transform'd to fish, for their bold surquedry. (xii. 31)

It is clear that the 'proud beauties' with their 'bold surquedry' (arrogance) represent the Deadly Sin of Pride. Guyon is in danger of succumbing to this same vice; he is pleased by the flattering song and bids the boat slow down in order that he may better hear it. The Palmer upbraids him for his 'vanity' and succeeds in dissuading him. With this final hazard overcome, land is sighted. Guyon steps ashore and sets out to fulfil his mission of destroying the Bower of Bliss.

### III

The system of the Seven Deadly Sins, while giving to Book II great variety in episodes and characters, is subordinate to the dominant theme of temperance. We can best understand the function of this system by considering Book II as a drama in five acts. Act I (Cantos i and ii) describes the background and introduces an episode that presents Guyon with an objective suitable to him in his role as the knight of temperance. Act II (Cantos ii-vii) depicts the various obstacles to his mission. The first five Deadly Sins—those designated spiritual by St. Gregory and subsequent authorities—appear in the traditional order of Pride, Envy, Wrath, Sloth, and Avarice. At the same time, the theme of temperance is constantly before our minds: Guyon is described as moderating his anger and as rejecting wealth and worldly honours in the name of 'temperance'. Strictly speaking, however, Guyon is here manifesting the Aristotelian concept of continence, or moderation in a general sense, rather than temperance which has as its object the control of the appetites for food, drink, and sex.<sup>1</sup> The use of the word 'temperance' in this broad sense was traditional, and St. Thomas Aquinas found it necessary to distinguish between temperance in the proper sense of the term—control of the pleasures of taste and touch—and temperance in the general sense of temperateness or moderation, an element in every virtue.<sup>2</sup> Guyon manifests this latter kind of 'temperance' by moderating his anger when attacked by Pyrochles and by rejecting Mammon's wealth and Philotime's worldly honours. But the sojourn in the Cave of Mammon leaves Guyon in a weakened condition; on returning to the surface of the earth he faints and is set upon by Pyrochles and Cymochles. He is saved only by the timely arrival of Prince Arthur (Canto viii). The two knights then retire to the House of Alma where Act III takes place (Cantos ix-xi). After Guyon departs from there in order to resume his mission the House is besieged by twelve knights, seven of whom attack the gates and five the bulwarks. The former presumably

<sup>1</sup> *Nicomachean Ethics*, iii. 10-12 (temperance) and vii (continence). For a discussion of these two concepts, see H. S. V. Jones, *A Spenser Handbook* (New York, 1940), pp. 178-82.

<sup>2</sup> *Summa Theologica*, II-II, q. 141, a. 2.



represent the Seven Deadly Sins, but they receive no further mention and attention is concentrated on the latter. The detailed account of their attacks on the bulwarks of the five senses is appropriate to the dominant theme of temperance in as much as the senses are the means by which the bodily appetites are aroused and made susceptible to the carnal sins; it is significant that the attack takes place only after the departure of the knight of temperance. The substance of Act IV (Canto xii. 1-37) is Guyon's three-day voyage across the sea full of perils before reaching the Bower of Bliss. The hazardous voyage is in part a recapitulation of what has preceded and in part an anticipation of what is to come. All the Seven Sins are included; they appear in approximately the reverse of the traditional order of enumeration, beginning with the carnal sins of Gluttony and Lust and progressing through the spiritual sins to culminate in Pride. Finally, Act v opens with Guyon's arrival at his destination. His victory over Excess and Acrasia is the victory of temperance in the proper sense of the term over the two opposed vices. But these vices are also the carnal sins in the system of the Deadly Sins. What the pagan moralists arrived at by analysing the nature of temperance corresponds to what the Fathers and Scholastics deduced by considering the origins of sin. Guyon's adventures and his final triumph dramatically illustrate the harmony between classical and Christian ethical thought.



# THOMAS NASHE, ROBERT COTTON THE ANTIQUARY, AND *THE TERRORS* *OF THE NIGHT*

By C. G. HARLOW

VERY little is known about the life of Thomas Nashe. After he left Cambridge he can be traced, for instance, at various times in London, and for periods in the service of Archbishop Whitgift at Croydon, with Sir George Carey in the Isle of Wight, and as a refugee from justice at Yarmouth. But most of his life is at the best a matter for conjecture, at the worst a blank.

For all the problems surrounding Nashe's life, R. B. McKerrow's great edition established the principal facts.<sup>1</sup> One matter, however, that McKerrow left unexamined is the location of a house, some sixty miles from London, where Nashe stayed one February between 1592 and 1594. The visit is mentioned in *The Terrors of the Night*, a work which achieved no fame when it was written, did not altogether please its author, and is little read today; yet it contains, I believe, a clue to one of the circles of society, hitherto unnoticed, in which Nashe moved at this time.

## I

*The Terrors of the Night* was published in 1594, although the date of composition was earlier: 'a long time since hath it line suppressed by mee', Nashe says in the dedication.<sup>2</sup> Towards the end of this somewhat rambling 'discourse of apparitions' (as the subtitle calls it), he enlivened the work with an account of a series of strange visions seen by a gentleman, shortly before he died, in the place where Nashe was staying. He withheld the identity of the man and his house, but tells us something about both. Some of the details which he gives are mentioned as factors that possibly brought on the visions, others are offered as hints, intended to convince the sceptical that he had a real occasion in mind, without embarrassing the family of the dead man by revealing who he was.

Nashe believed that dreams and apparitions are not usually premonitions,

<sup>1</sup> *The Works of Thomas Nashe* (2nd edn. revised by F. P. Wilson, with a supplement, Oxford, 1958). References are to this edition.

For help and advice on special points I am grateful to many of my colleagues in the University of Glasgow, and to Mr. N. R. Ker, Dr. C. E. Wright, and Dr. J. A. W. Bennett. Other acknowledgements are made in the appropriate places.

<sup>2</sup> *Works*, i. 341. 22.

but simply the outcome of 'foeculent combustible ayrie matter' in the brain.<sup>1</sup> But he qualifies his opinion in the following words:

I write not this, for that I thinke there are no true apparitions or prodigies, but to shew how easily we may be flouted if we take not great heed, with our own anticke suppositions. I will tell you a strange tale tending to this nature: whether of true melancholy or true apparition, I will not take vpon me to determine.

It was my chance in Februarie last to be in the Countrey some threescore myle off from London; where a Gentleman of good worship and credit falling sicke, the verie second day of his lying downe, hee pretended to haue miraculous waking visions: which before I enter to describe, thus much I will informe ye by the way, that at the reporting of them he was in perfect memorie; nor had sicknes yet so tyrannized ouer him to make his tongue grow idle. A wise graue sensible man he was euer reputed, and so approou'd himselfe in all his actions in his life time. This which I deliuer, (with manie preparatiue protestations) to a great Man of this Land hee confidently avouched: beleuee it or condemn it, as you shal see cause, for I leaue it to be censured indifferently.<sup>2</sup>

The account of the visions follows; they were interrupted by the arrival of 'a messenger from a Knight of great honour thereabouts, who sent him a most precious extract quintessence to drinke'. This brought temporary relief, but 'within foure howers after, hauing not fully settled his estate in order, hee grewe to trifling dotage, and rauing dyde within two daies following'.<sup>3</sup>

A second passage adds to the information he has already given:

Are there anie doubts which remaine in your mynde vndigested, as touching this incredible Narration I haue vnfolded? Well, doubt you not, but I am milde and tractable, and will resolute you in what I may.

First, the house where this Gentleman dwelt, stood in a low marish ground, almost as rotten a Clymate as the Lowe Countreyes; where their mystie ayre is as thicke as mould butter, and the deaw lyes like froathie barme on the ground.

It was noted ouer and besides to haue been an vnluckie house to all his predecessors, scituate in a quarter not altogether exempted from witches.

The abrupt falling into his sicknesse was suspicious, proceeding from no apparant surfet or misdiet. The outrageous tyrannie of it in so short a time, bred thrice more admiration and wonder, and his sodaine death incontinent ensuing vpon that his disclosed dreame or vision, might seeme some probable reason to confirme it; since none haue such palpable dreames or visions, but die presently after.<sup>4</sup>

Miss M. C. Bradbrook has identified the place as Hitchin in Herts. and the dying gentleman as George Chapman who lived there; the visions are Nashe's fantasy, they and the whole work having been devised to satirize

<sup>1</sup> i. 377. 34.

<sup>2</sup> i. 378. 6-25.

<sup>3</sup> i. 381. 31-33, and 381. 37-382. 2.

<sup>4</sup> i. 382. 24-383. 7.

Chapman and Raleigh's 'School of Night'.<sup>1</sup> But Hitchin is only thirty miles from London, Chapman was to live for many years still, and it seems to have been overlooked that a house and a situation existed that fit very closely the story that Nashe tells. This emerges if we observe his directions more narrowly, for they are less vague than they might appear at first sight. Three hints are particularly significant: the peculiar 'Clymate'; the reference to witchcraft; and the distance, 'some threescore myle' from London.

*Clymate* in Nashe's context means a region or district, not as today the atmospheric conditions of a place;<sup>2</sup> the comparison with the Low Countries and the marshy ground point unmistakably, as McKerrow saw, to the fens.<sup>3</sup> Lincolnshire, which Nashe visited in 1595, is obviously too far away; the only fens within possible range are those which once occupied large areas of Huntingdonshire, south Cambridgeshire, and north-west Suffolk.

The words 'not altogether exempted from witches' are curious. If they are taken, as I think they must be, as a simple litotes, they should place the event somewhere in Essex, for the witch-trials in that county at the end of the sixteenth century outnumbered the total of all those in the other four counties of the Home Circuit—witchcraft at this time was prevailingly a phenomenon of the south-east.<sup>4</sup> Yet Essex and the other home counties, though they contained isolated marshes, had nowhere that could properly be described in Nashe's terms 'almost as rotten a Clymate as the Lowe Countreyes', and most of the area is too near London to be called 'some threescore myle' away. It is necessary to find another area that had acquired notoriety. Such is provided by Huntingdon and its neighbourhood, which in 1592 came, for peculiar reasons, into a sudden and unexpected reputation for witches temporarily eclipsing that of all other areas.

I shall argue that Nashe was staying at Conington, near Huntingdon, in the house of the wealthy antiquary Robert Cotton. The head of an important Huntingdonshire family, he took an active part in seventeenth-century politics, but is remembered today rather as the founder of the Cottonian Library, the magnificent collection of manuscripts which by the gift of his descendant became one of the foundation collections of the British Museum.<sup>5</sup> This hypothesis, if accepted, will entail some revision

<sup>1</sup> M. C. Bradbrook, *The School of Night* (Cambridge, 1936), pp. 172-8.

<sup>2</sup> O.E.D., *Clymate*, sb. 2.

<sup>3</sup> *Works*, v. 18. 4. That Nashe had fenland scenery at least in his thoughts when he was writing the work appears from his words in i. 354. 2-5.

<sup>4</sup> C. H. L'Estrange Ewen, *Witchcraft and Witch Trials* (London, 1929), p. 100; W. Notestein, *A History of Witchcraft in England* (Baltimore, 1911), p. 49; and R. Trevor Davies, *Four Centuries of Witch Beliefs* (London, 1947), p. 19.

<sup>5</sup> For Cotton's life, see Thomas Smith, *Catalogus Librorum Manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Cottonianae* (Oxford, 1696); E. Edwards, *Lives of the Founders of the British Museum* (London, 1870); and C. E. Wright, 'The Elizabethan Society of Antiquaries and the

of McKerrow's view on the time and place of composition of the work, but it has the advantage of supplying the two occasions that the text of the work has always required: one for its composition, and another for its later publication.

## II

Conington is on the very edge of the fens, some seventy miles from London, and Thomas Cotton, the father of the antiquary, died there in 1592. Since I have not been able to discover any contemporary statement or tradition about the manner of his death, it is necessary to examine the similarities between the two situations in detail.

(1) Thomas Cotton's house<sup>1</sup> stood some 250 yards from the marsh which surrounded Whittlesea Mere, in a 'climate' remarkable enough to be singled out for comment by Camden, in the 1594 edition of *Britannia*, in terms which agree closely with Nashe's:

But these Quarters, considering the ground lying so low, and for many moneths in the yeare surrounded and drowned, in some places also floting (as it were) [margin: *Mosses*] and hoven up with the waters, are not free from the offensive noisomnesse of Meres and the unwholesome aire of the Fennes. . . . As for the unhealthinesse of the place, whereunto only strangers, and not the natives there are subject, who live long and healthfully, there is amends made, as they account it, by the commodity of fishing, the plentifull feeding, and the abundance of turfe gotten for fewell.<sup>2</sup>

The presence of the mere, the largest lake in the south of England (some six miles long and three miles broad at that time, according to Camden), would make the surrounding country even more susceptible to fogs than the rest of the fens.

(2) Huntingdon was the scene of the most notorious English witch-trial of the sixteenth century. At Warboys, some eight miles from Conington, Alice and John Samuel, with their daughter Agnes, were accused of bewitching the five children of Robert Throckmorton, the head of a prominent Huntingdonshire family, and causing the death by witchcraft of Lady

Formation of the Cottonian Library', in F. Wormald and C. E. Wright (edd.), *The English Library before 1700* (London, 1958).

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Cotton lived for part of his life in the neighbouring manor of Denton, but there must have been another house belonging to the family at Conington, as well as the ruins of the older house, Bruce Castle (see p. 15, n. 7). I have assumed that the Conington house was on the same site as that built later by Robert Cotton. If it was on the site of Bruce Castle, it was even closer to the fen. The position of both sites is shown on a map of c. 1595, reproduced in W. Page, G. Proby, and S. Inskip Ladds, *The Victoria History of the County of Huntingdon* (London, 1926-36), iii. 144.

<sup>2</sup> Quoted in Holland's translation from the edition of 1637. The passage first appeared in the Latin edition of 1594.

Cromwell, wife of Sir Henry Cromwell of Hinchbrook, Huntingdon. Though the trial did not take place until April 1593, the children's illness could be traced back to November 1589, and it was definitely attributed to 'Mother Samuel's' bewitchment by February 1590. From November 1590 Lady Cromwell, after trying to browbeat Mother Samuel into confessing, began to suffer from the same symptoms as the children, grew steadily worse, and died in July 1592, two months after Thomas Cotton's death. The case must therefore have been well known locally from 1590, and other misfortunes in the neighbourhood came to be attributed to the witches. Mother Samuel was examined before the Bishop of Lincoln at the end of December 1592, and eventually all three Samuels were tried at the Assizes in Huntingdon in April 1593, found guilty, and executed.

The notoriety of the case was due to two circumstances: unlike any earlier case, it involved the members of prominent and wealthy families; and the story became common knowledge through the publication of a well-written pamphlet containing a long and detailed account of the bewitchment and trial, probably from the hand of one of the judges. Two editions appeared in 1593, and the story was popularized the same year in a ballad.<sup>1</sup>

(3) We can infer two things from what Nashe says about the gentleman who died: he was a man of some substance, for he left his estate 'not fully settled'; and his ancestors (the most likely meaning of *predecessors* in this context) had lived for a considerable time at the place where Nashe stayed, for the house had been in some way unlucky to them.

Huntingdonshire is a small county, and the best source for tracing important men who died there, the list of inquisitions post mortem, yields only three names between 1591 and 1593. One was a William Gery, who died on 12 December 1592, and who held land in the parish of Great Staughton, though his residence was Bushmead Priory, across the border in Bedfordshire; in both estates the ground is too high and too far from the fens to fit Nashe's description. Another was a Robert Diccons who died not long before January 1592 with a house and lands at Elton; his unimportance (the family was not entitled to bear arms) and the distance from the fens may safely eliminate him also. The third was Thomas Cotton,

<sup>1</sup> *The Most Strange and Admirable Discoverie of the three Witches of Warboys* (London, 1593). The pamphlet is most easily accessible in a reprint, with modernized language, by Richard Boulton, *A Compleat History of Magic, Sorcery, and Witchcraft* (London, 1715), i. 49-152. For the great importance of the case, see the works of Notestein and Davies cited p. 9, n. 4. For a bibliography see H. E. Norris, 'The Witches of Warboys: Bibliographical Note', *N. & Q.*, 12th ser., i (1916), 283-4, 304-5. Here and in later works it is wrongly stated that there were *three* early editions of the pamphlet, but Norris's First Edition (Gough Hunts (3) in the Bodleian Library) appears to be only an imperfect copy of his Third Edition. The ballad is known only from an entry in the Stationers' Register.



who died on 30 May 1592.<sup>1</sup> He was only forty-eight years of age, and since his youngest child was born as recently as 1590, he should not have been by any means an invalid or prematurely aged two years later. The fact that his will, drawn up in 1588 or 1589, was in certain obvious respects out of date suggests that he died suddenly and unexpectedly.<sup>2</sup>

One difficulty is that McKerrow dated the gentleman's death in February, while Thomas Cotton died in May. This might be explained as a discrepancy due to faulty memory or to confusion between two or more visits to the same house, but a closer examination shows that McKerrow was more rigid in his interpretation than Nashe's words required him to be. Nashe only claims (see below) that his pamphlet was compiled *upon the accidental occasion* (which may be paraphrased as 'the chance cause', without reference to the time of occurrence) of these visions, and he nowhere explicitly states he was there when the gentleman died. The simplest explanation is that Nashe only heard the story and wrote his pamphlet in February 1593, on a single visit to the house. But since the whole question of the composition of the work is involved, we should first reconsider the internal evidence, for McKerrow's interpretation in any case requires revision.

McKerrow argued that the gentleman's death occurred in February 1592; that Nashe 'composed—or perhaps rather compiled—' his pamphlet in January or February 1593, while he was staying in the Isle of Wight with Sir George Carey;<sup>3</sup> and that it was published in 1594 with two additions: a passage about the Careys which contains a reference to the 1594 edition of Camden's *Britannia*, and the dedication to Mistress Elizabeth Carey.<sup>4</sup> This chronology conflicts with Nashe's two clear statements about the composition of the work.

The first is: 'A litle to beguile time idly discontented, and satisfie some of my solitary friends heere in the Countrey, I haue hastily vndertooke to write of the wearie fancies of the Night.'<sup>5</sup>

The second statement refers to the visions of the dying man: 'Vpon the accidental occasion of this dreame or apparition . . . was this Pamphlet (no bigger than an old Præface) speedily botcht vp and compyled.'<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Chanc. I.p.m. (Ser. ii), ccxxxii. 70, in the P.R.O. This also shows that he died at Conington. I am grateful to Mr. A. G. R. Smith for examining the manuscript for me. For a fourth death in the county, in 1592, but not otherwise satisfying the requirements, see *V.C.H. Huntingdon*, iii. 80.

<sup>2</sup> Rebecca Cotton was baptized on 3 May 1590, according to Conington parish register, which the rector, the Rev. E. A. Bishop, kindly allowed me to consult. For Thomas Cotton's will, see p. 14, n. 2.

<sup>3</sup> *Works*, v. 22. 8 and 29-30.

<sup>4</sup> i. 345. 4-7. This passage, appropriate for a small gathering of friends in Conington, is wholly inadequate to describe the brilliant society in which Sir George Carey moved at Carisbrooke Castle.

<sup>5</sup> iv. 197. 12-17.

<sup>6</sup> i. 382. 19-23.



These statements were clearly written at different times.

The natural interpretation of the first is that the original work was written soon after the gentleman's death, or, as I prefer to believe, when Nashe first heard the story; but of the second, that it could not have originally contained the account of the visions, for these are introduced as a past event ('in Februarie last'), and would surely not be worth recounting to those staying in the house (his 'solitary friends heere in the Countrey') to whom they would be common knowledge—they were, so to speak, a text on which Nashe's original pamphlet was a commentary, added only when Nashe thought of presenting it to the general public.

If this interpretation of what Nashe says is added to McKerrow's view that Nashe was in the Isle of Wight in February 1593, it becomes necessary to modify his chronology: we should have to suppose that the original work was written in February 1592; revised in January or not later than in February 1593, when the account of the visions was added; considered for publication in June 1593, when it was entered in the Stationers' Register;<sup>1</sup> and finally printed with more additions in 1594.

So complicated a history for its composition is not impossible. But if Nashe was in the Isle of Wight in February 1594 (not 1593), which is a permissible interpretation of the available evidence,<sup>2</sup> recourse may be had to a different chronology, which, being simpler, is also more satisfactory: the original work was written on a visit to Conington in February 1593, when Nashe first heard the story; publication was under consideration in June 1593, perhaps the period when Nashe was in 'most forsaken extremities';<sup>3</sup> at this time, too, the account of the visions would have been added in order to explain the 'occasion' for the work; some time in 1594 the work was put into its final form, with the addition of the passage about the Careys (containing the reference to *Britannia*) and the dedication.

This new chronology, it must be admitted, does not account for the fact that Nashe *seems* to put the gentleman's death at the time of his visit in February 1593, whereas Thomas Cotton died eight months before. I should account for this in the following way. Nashe did not hear the story at first hand, nor does he say who told it to him, only that he has not 'one iot abuse my informations' in telling it.<sup>4</sup> Such stories of dreams and witchcraft were the common small-talk of Elizabethan society,<sup>5</sup> and the only interest

<sup>1</sup> i. 337.

<sup>2</sup> I hope to show this elsewhere. McKerrow himself was at first doubtful (iii. 96. 1 and note).

<sup>3</sup> i. 374. 35. Since Nashe was secure in a patron in the autumn of 1592, McKerrow was driven to suppose these words referred to an earlier, unrecorded, occasion when Carey helped him.

<sup>4</sup> i. 382. 4-5.

<sup>5</sup> e.g. i. 383. 14-34.

in Nashe's story arose from its authenticity, which he was careful to establish. Yet he had already weakened this by admitting that the story came to him at second hand; it would have lost most of its value if he had also admitted that he only heard it eight months after the event. He therefore left his statement deliberately ambiguous: in February he was in the place *where* the death occurred; he does not say he was there *when* it occurred.<sup>1</sup>

If this explanation is accepted, it will be seen that the remaining facts fall neatly into place.

(4) The numerous legal documents relating to Thomas Cotton's estate drawn up after his death show that Nashe was amply justified in stating that he died 'hauing not fully settled his estate in order'.<sup>2</sup>

(5) The visions were told to 'a great Man of this Land'. Robert Cotton was only twenty-one when his father died, but he had already made a name for himself as a scholar and antiquary. Before 1590 he was a founder-member of the Elizabethan Society of Antiquaries, and had acquired his first manuscripts;<sup>3</sup> and in 1592 he was already known to James Gruter, the classical scholar, who expected his help in compiling a corpus of Latin inscriptions,<sup>4</sup> while Dr. John Case, the Oxford scholar, eminent alike in theology, political theory, music, and medicine, addressed him in such terms as *Dignissime Doctissimeque Cottone*.<sup>5</sup>

Robert Cotton had another title to fame: he was a descendant of Robert de Brus of Annandale, the brother of two kings of Scotland and grand-

<sup>1</sup> It might be objected that this makes Nashe's hints confusing for his reader; how could he associate a death which Nashe seems to place in February 1593 with Thomas Cotton's, which occurred in May 1592? But surely the exact date is the least important element to the reader. Either he knew the story of Thomas Cotton's death, or he did not. If he knew it, the alteration of date would make no difference. If he did not, he would not be likely, in 1594, to remember to within a few months exactly when he died.

<sup>2</sup> I am indebted to Mr. G. H. Findlay, the County Archivist, for permission to see the documents in the Huntingdon Record Office (Conington Estate Papers C 93-110). Thomas Cotton made a will in 1588 or 1589 (it is referred to, though it does not survive, in the family papers), but it was in several respects inadequate and out of date by 1592. Though he provided more generously than he was bound to do for his wife, he had not 'precisely performed' the terms of the indenture drawn up on his marriage. He left legacies to his daughters, but naturally no provision had been made for the youngest, Rebecca, born in 1590 (C 96). A significant passage is that in which Robert Cotton, with the agreement of the executors, annuls an indenture of 1588, the better to ensure 'the payment of such sommes of money as the said Thomas Cotton deceased ment and determynd to haue byn paid and assured to the said dorothy his last wief . . . which otherwise cannot be so well assured nor obtayned [my italics]' (C 97). This shows that he intended to alter his will, but died before he had done so.

<sup>3</sup> See Wormald and Wright, *English Library*, pp. 180, 182, 191. He was born in 1570. Since the printed lives tell little about his life before 1600, I have added information from various other sources.

<sup>4</sup> In a letter to Camden; see Thomas Smith, *Gulielmi Camdeni Epistolae* (London, 1691), p. 47.

<sup>5</sup> B.M. MS. Harley 6995, f. 96. On Case, see *D.N.B.*, and W. H. Stevenson and H. E. Salter, *The Early History of St. John's College Oxford* (Oxford, 1939), p. 337.

father of a third. He was thus related (and well aware of the fact) to James VI of Scotland, the most likely successor to Queen Elizabeth, and even in her lifetime had begun to sign his name *Robert Cotton Bruceus*. The family relationship, though distant, was recognized by James when he became King of England.<sup>1</sup>

By birth, wealth, and accomplishments, Robert Cotton might already be called a great man, and there is a further point of agreement in that he had as yet no title.<sup>2</sup> Nashe was punctilious about titles, even when he withheld names;<sup>3</sup> the fact that he calls the recipient of his story only a *great Man* shows that he had not even a knighthood or a doctorate, and limits the search for possible candidates.

(6) 'A Knight of great honour thereabouts . . . sent him a most precious extract quintessence to drinke.' Sir Henry Cromwell, husband of Lady Cromwell, the victim of the Warboys witches, was the most wealthy commoner in England, and was known as 'The Golden Knight' because of his liberality and magnificence.<sup>4</sup> The care of his dying wife would have given him good experience in the medical treatment of hallucinations, since her illness or bewitchment began with a dream.

(7) 'An unluckie house to all his predecessors.' This statement helps to exclude a large number of Elizabethan houses: those that had only recently been built, and those that had only recently come into their present ownership.

Most of the important Huntingdonshire families at this period were newcomers, who acquired their lands after the dissolution of the monasteries, the Cromwells and Throckmortons among them. Robert Cotton's ancestors, however, had held the manor of Conington since the thirteenth century, and the house was probably an old one, since Robert Cotton rebuilt it before 1600.<sup>5</sup> Thomas Cotton, his father, was exceptional in that he lived after his marriage in the neighbouring manor of Denton, though he was at Conington when he died.<sup>6</sup>

No tradition of the Conington house being unlucky to the Cottons has survived. The words may have some reference to Thomas Cotton's removal to Denton,<sup>7</sup> but they would apply better to the early deaths

<sup>1</sup> Edwards, *Lives*, pp. 50-51. Wormald and Wright, *English Library*, p. 200. Smith, *Catalogus*, p. iv.

<sup>2</sup> His titles came later, from King James.

<sup>3</sup> e.g. i. 153. 22; 381. 31; iii. 76. 35.

<sup>4</sup> Mark Noble, *Memoirs of the Protectoral House of Cromwell* (London, 1787), i. 22.

<sup>5</sup> *V.C.H. Huntingdon*, iii. 144-51.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 148, and I.p.m.

<sup>7</sup> Smith, at the end of the seventeenth century, attributed the removal to overcrowding at the Conington house (*Catalogus*, p. iii). Nashe's words might be a different and older explanation. *V.C.H. Huntingdon* (iii. 145) doubts whether Bruce Castle, the original Conington house, was habitable much after 1576. There must, however, have been a large habitable mansion somewhere at Conington, since the whole family were living there in

of Thomas's brothers and his two immediate forebears, also named Thomas.<sup>1</sup>

Since Nashe's account does not demand that he should have been staying in the old house in February 1593, it is possible that Robert Cotton's rebuilding was under way, or even completed, when Nashe wrote the above words; it would not have been propitious to call it 'an vnluckie house' if Robert Cotton still lived there.

### III

It may be objected that the evidence so far adduced only proves, if it proves anything, that Nashe was staying in Robert Cotton's house,<sup>2</sup> not that the owner was there then or knew Nashe at all. Conceivably Nashe might have been the friend of one of the other members of the family who were living at Conington when his father died; but in 1593 it was in Robert's hands, as heir, that the wealth and influence lay, and for other reasons too it is more likely that Nashe stayed there as Robert's guest.

Already in 1592 the antiquaries had attracted Nashe's interest. In *Pierce Penilesse*, written in that year, he made a general assault upon the vices of the times, and under the heading of Pride found room for a curious passage which bears the marginal comment: 'The commendation of Antiquaries. Laudamus veteres, sed nostris vtimur annis.' The text runs:

An Antiquarie is an honest man, for hee had rather scrape a peece of copper out of the durt, than a crowne out of *Ploydens* standish. I know many wise Gentlemen of this mustie vocation, who, out of loue with the times wherein they liue, fall a retayling of *Alexanders* stirrops, because (in veritie) there is not suche a strong peece of stretching leather made now adayes, nor yron so well tempred for any money.<sup>3</sup>

Then follow some examples of the way antiquaries 'doate on worme-

1592 (*V.C.H. Huntingdon*, iii. 148). The late Mr. J. N. Heathcote argued that Robert Cotton merely made alterations to an older house on the other site (unpublished manuscript history of Conington Castle, kindly lent to me by Mr. J. H. B. Heathcote, the present owner). This agrees with Camden, who writes (*Britannia*, edn. of 1590) of the *vestigia expressa castris antiqui* on the site of Bruce Castle, which does not suggest recent destruction.

<sup>1</sup> Robert's great-grandfather died at the age of thirty-seven, leaving his son a ward of two; his grandfather died at the age of fifty-nine. Of Robert's five uncles, all of whom were living at Conington in 1574, only two were there in 1592 (*V.C.H. Huntingdon*, iii. 148). Of the other three, one, Robert, died in 1586, and the others may be presumed to have died, since no provision was made for them after Thomas Cotton's death. Robert the antiquary's mother died when he was a boy, but this may have been at Denton.

<sup>2</sup> Nashe does not actually state that he was on a visit to the house of the dead gentleman or his heir, but his detailed knowledge renders any other explanation difficult. The writing of the pamphlet there for his 'solitary friends' shows that he was not merely staying the night at the inn on his way down the Great North Road.

<sup>3</sup> i. 182. 16-22.

eaten Elde', delude other people with false antiques, or are themselves deluded by dealers. The attack is obviously aimed only at the ignorant amateur and the charlatan, but within a few weeks it came to Nashe's ears that some of the antiquaries had taken his words as a general attack on their profession. In a letter to the printer which prefaces the second edition, he was careful to explain his meaning:

The Antiquaries are offended without cause, thinking I goe about to detract from that excellent profession, when (God is my witnesse) I reuerence it as much as any of them all, and had no manner of allusion to them that stumble at it. I hope they will giue me leaue to think there be fooles of that Art as well as of al other; but to say I vtterly condemne it as an vnfruitfull studie or seeme to despise the excellent qualified partes of it, is a most false and iniurious surmise.<sup>1</sup>

People of many different ranks and interests smarted under the whip of Nashe's scorn, and it may be a pointer to the company he then kept that the above was the only one of many insults in *Pierce Penilesse* that he troubled to redress. We are not justified, it is true, in deducing from this that he was personally acquainted with members of the Society of Antiquaries, a small and exclusive body; there were others who claimed the title without being members of the Society. For a time, which probably included the year 1592, Nashe was evidently a member of Archbishop Whitgift's household, where he would move in a more open circle of antiquaries and scholars.<sup>2</sup> At the end of this period, when he wrote *Strange Newes* (December or January 1592/3), he was living, he says, 'in a house of credit, as well gouerned as any Colledge, where there bee more rare quallified men and selected good Schollers than in any Noblemans house that I knowe in England'. This description fits the archbishop's palace perfectly, since Nashe refers to its head as 'my Lord';<sup>3</sup> it could not have applied to the Society of Antiquaries, since no member was a peer at this date, and its meetings were held in Darby House, the heralds' office.<sup>4</sup> In Whitgift's household, Nashe could have met Camden, who was on friendly terms with the archbishop;<sup>5</sup> from Camden, it would be a small step to meet Cotton, who had been Camden's pupil at Westminster and was now his

<sup>1</sup> i. 154. 25-33.

<sup>2</sup> *Works*, v, Supplement, p. 74. Whitgift was not, as it used to be asserted, the patron or even a member of the Elizabethan Society of Antiquaries; his name does not appear in any of the lists of attendances at its meetings; but he was certainly, like his predecessor, Matthew Parker, a supporter of antiquarian studies. See Joan Evans, *A History of the Society of Antiquaries* (Oxford, 1956), p. 9.

<sup>3</sup> i. 329. 22-25; 27.

<sup>4</sup> Evans, pp. 9-10.

<sup>5</sup> In July 1592 Whitgift wrote to Camden, asking him to read and report on a book before he authorized it for printing, and signed himself *your louinge frend* (MS. Cotton Julius C v, f. 22<sup>r</sup>).



devoted friend.<sup>1</sup> But Nashe may have met Cotton before this, as we shall see.

## IV

The possibility of an even closer connexion arises if we ask what led Nashe to write *The Terrors of the Night*.

To judge from his own expressions of dissatisfaction, it was not a labour of love. Indeed it seems to have been written almost to order, for he tells Elizabeth Carey: 'You partly are acquainted from whose motiue imposition it first proceeded, as also what strange sodaine cause necessarily produced that motion.'<sup>2</sup>

Some person or persons persuaded him to write the pamphlet, and from other evidence Cotton or the circle of Cotton's friends seems the obvious mover. This other evidence is as follows.

The central theme of this discursive work is the nature and causes of dreams and apparitions, to which various subsidiary matters (discussions of spirits, the false 'interpretation' of dreams, the knaveries of astrologers and quacks) are acknowledged digressions. About his main theme Nashe comes down firmly on one side of the argument: 'When all is said, melancholy is the mother of dreames, and of all terrours of the night whatsoeuer',<sup>3</sup> and a long section of the work is therefore devoted to the effects of melancholy.<sup>4</sup>

Now, by good fortune, we know that Robert Cotton was ill or depressed in spirits a few months after his father's death in 1592, and that his affliction was due to melancholy. We can see, indeed, that he was subject to three of the most potent causes of melancholy that sixteenth-century medical theory recognized: he was a scholar; his home at Conington was in an unwholesome, marshy climate; and he may have felt more than common grief on the death of his father, since he had lost his mother in his childhood.<sup>5</sup>

Four unpublished letters from Dr. John Case, who has been mentioned above, tell us about the illness. Writing on 27 October Case warns Cotton that his whole constitution is melancholic, and that he must not allow the 'Hydra', Melancholy, to live, or it will acquire many heads and become very difficult to expel. A few months before, on 30 March, Case had

<sup>1</sup> There is evidence that Nashe knew at least one other member of the Society of Antiquaries, John Stow. See McKerrow's note on i. 242. 12-13. That Nashe had anything to do with the Society as such is very unlikely; he had not 'the plodding patience' for scholarship. The Society met only once in this period, on 6 May 1592, and at no other time during that year or the next.

<sup>2</sup> i. 341. 19-22.

<sup>3</sup> i. 357. 17-19.

<sup>4</sup> i. 353. 33-357. 36.

<sup>5</sup> For a study of Elizabethan melancholy, see L. Babb, *The Elizabethan Malady* (Michigan, 1951).



urged him: 'annales et historias nostrorum temporum volue.' Now, he is to avoid solitude and the study of difficult matters, revive his spirits by giving himself to respectable recreations and pleasures, and to open the liver and spleen by the use of purgatives. Cotton and his wife are invited to visit Case at Oxford.<sup>1</sup> The visit was made, and various drugs prescribed,<sup>2</sup> but on 28 December, to judge from the tone of another letter, Cotton had still not fully recovered his health.<sup>3</sup>

Melancholy was a fashionable disease at this time, it is true, but when the central theme of Nashe's work and the cause of Robert Cotton's illness are found to be one and the same, the temptation to search for a connexion is hard to resist.

Contemporary cures for melancholy recommend that the patient should never be left alone. 'He should hunt, fish, take part in athletic sports, make journeys, attend plays and pageants, frequent social gatherings.'<sup>4</sup> Dr. Case might well have recommended the drama as one of Cotton's 'respectable recreations and pleasures'; during the Puritan attack on the stage he was an active defender of the theatre,<sup>5</sup> and one item of news which he passed on to Cotton on 28 December was that the theatres were still open in London, despite the plague. Cotton's interest in the drama is well attested, though only at a later date: he was, for instance, the friend of Ben Jonson, who was his guest at Conington in 1603; in 1606 John Pory sent Cotton an account of Jonson's masque, *Hymenaei*; and in 1615 Cotton is named as one of 'the right worshipfull Fraternitie of Sirenicall Gentlemen' who met at the Mermaid.<sup>6</sup> But there is no reason to think his interest was late in growing. Between 1588 and 1591 he was a member of the Middle Temple and a close friend of the poet and wit, Sir John Davies, with whom he shared chambers. At Candlemas in 1591, an occasion when some form of dramatic entertainment was traditional, Davies joined other Templars in setting up a 'Lord of Misrule', and was duly fined.<sup>7</sup> Robert Cotton may reasonably be

<sup>1</sup> B.M. MS. Harley 6995, f. 61 and f. 96.

<sup>2</sup> This appears from a letter dated 7 November in B.M. MS. Cotton Julius C III, f. 197<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> Harley 6995, f. 115. Case writes: 'te ergo pre ceteris inter amicissimos saluto optoque vi repuerascens quasi Janus te fronte serena intreatur, vtque viuas, valeas, sisque in omnibus quae conaris ter quaterque beatus.'

<sup>4</sup> Babb, p. 39.

<sup>5</sup> E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage* (Oxford, 1923), i. 250.

<sup>6</sup> C. H. Herford, Percy and Evelyn Simpson, *Ben Jonson* (Oxford, 1925-52), i. 49 n., 139-40. Chambers, iii. 379.

<sup>7</sup> C. T. Martin, *Minutes of Parliament of the Middle Temple* (London, 1904), i. 318, 322. The quality of their friendship is to be inferred from a letter written by Davies probably between 1595 and 1598, in which he addresses Cotton as 'Sweet Robin'—see A. B. Grosart, *The Complete Prose Works of Sir John Davies* (1876), i. cxiii-cxiv. Was it through Cotton that Nashe got to know of Davies's *Nosce Teipsum*, presumably in an early version, at this time? As McKerrow pointed out, the reference to *John Davies soule in Strange News* (i. 258. 17) must be to this work, which was not printed until 1599.

supposed to have shared his taste for the drama at this time, and since one of Dr. Case's counsels had been to avoid solitude, he would have been grateful, in January and February 1593, to be diverted by the lively company of a dramatist and wit like Thomas Nashe. The social life of the Inns of Court, a centre alike for young men of wit and for members of the Society of Antiquaries, could have brought them together; they may have met even earlier, for Cotton, at Jesus College, Cambridge, was an exact contemporary of Nashe at St. John's.

If Nashe was staying as a guest at Cotton's house, the occasion for writing *The Terrors of the Night* could have been something like the following. Thomas Cotton's sudden illness and death, and Robert Cotton's illness, seem both to have been due, in Elizabethan parlance, to melancholy, but there were many people in Huntingdonshire in January and February 1593 who would attribute them to more sinister causes, especially since the supposed deeds of the Warboys witches had been made public at their examination in Huntingdon at the end of December. Nashe attributed Thomas Cotton's visions to 'true melancholy or true apparition', but acknowledged that the area was 'not altogether exempted from witches' and that the circumstances were suspicious. Robert Cotton may likewise have entertained thoughts of a malicious and supernatural origin for his illness. *The Terrors of the Night*, written that February in its original short form 'no bigger than an old Præface', may have been a task imposed upon Nashe, and intended to act as the introduction to a discussion, among Cotton's friends at Conington, of the causes and effects of melancholy, of dreams and apparitions in particular, for which Nashe used Thomas Cotton's visions as a starting-point. The discussions of the Society of Antiquaries were regularly opened by one or more short papers on a set subject.<sup>1</sup>

Whether Cotton should be regarded as Nashe's patron is doubtful, not least because his own words make it clear that he had not yet had the luck to find one.<sup>2</sup>

There seems to be no evidence to show when Cotton was living at his Conington house. From the general drift of Case's letter of 7 November, Cotton seems to have been in London then with Camden, who had fallen seriously ill on 26 October—Case was later to give him treatment—but the endorsement is missing. The letters of 30 March, 27 October, and 28 December are directed to Cotton 'at Combe'. This suggests that he did not live continuously at Conington, perhaps because fenny sites were held to aggravate melancholy; but family ties and the administration of the estate would call him back from time to time.

<sup>1</sup> Wormald and Wright, p. 181.

<sup>2</sup> *Works*, i. 361. 2-8.

Combe may tentatively be identified with Combe Abbey in Warwickshire, the home of Sir John Harington,<sup>1</sup> first cousin of Sir Philip Sidney and father of Lucy, Countess of Bedford, who was to rival the Countess of Pembroke as a literary patroness.<sup>2</sup> Whether Nashe ever accompanied Cotton to this house, so congenial to learning and literature, we cannot unfortunately tell.

As a former fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, and in later life a benefactor of the college, Dr. Case must surely have had a personal, and perhaps also a professional, interest in the Warboys affair. One of the fellows of St. John's in 1592 was Henry Cromwell, son of Sir Henry Cromwell by his first wife, Joan Warren, who was the stepdaughter of Sir Thomas White, founder of the college. Case, like all the early scholars, was a nominee of the founder. Henry Cromwell's interest in the Warboys affair is attested by a visit which he paid to the Throckmorton family on 29 March 1593, and by the fact that his stepmother was a victim. In these circumstances it would be strange if a physician so eminent as Case had not been called in.

There is also a curious link, which may or may not be significant, between *The Terrors of the Night* and the Warboys pamphlet. These two works (and one other) were entered in the Stationers' Register on the same day, 30 June 1593. The Warboys pamphlet was entered first, with the unusual words: 'being Recommended for matter of truthe by master Judge FFENNER vnder his handwrytinge shewed in a Court or assemblie holden this Daye according to thordonnances of the company'. The dedication of the pamphlet thanks Justice Fenner for 'the crossing of whatsoeuer Pamphlets should haue been preferd, respecting either the matter partly or confusedly', thus showing that others were trying to publish inferior versions of the story. It was John Danter, a notorious 'pirate' (with whom Nashe was on good terms), who entered and printed *The Terrors of the Night*, and also, later in 1593, entered a ballad of the Warboys

<sup>1</sup> Combe is a common place-name, especially in the south-west. This one must have been within reasonable reach of Oxford for Case to invite Cotton there with his wife for an examination; at the same time it cannot have been very near London, or Cotton would not have needed to be told the news of the city. Combe Abbey exactly fulfils the requirements. Sir John Harington of Combe, as he was then called (e.g. in Conington Estate Papers C 97), though he is better known as Lord Harington of Exton, his later title, was well known to the Cottons. The two families were collateral descendants of the Bruses, whose estates at Conington and Exton had been divided between them. Sir John was one of Thomas Cotton's executors, and still held rights in the estate, as well as half the advowson of Conington church. A postscript to one of Case's letters helps to confirm the identification: 'meo nomine quæso Nowellum tuum salutes' (Harley 6995, f. 96). This could not have been Laurence Nowell, the antiquary, who had died in 1576; but it might well have been Sir John Harington's brother-in-law, Sir Andrew Noel of Brooke, Rutland, or the latter's brother, Henry Noel the courtier.

<sup>2</sup> B. H. Newdigate, *Michael Drayton and his Circle* (Oxford, 1941), pp. 56-69; John Buxton, *Sir Philip Sidney and the English Renaissance* (London, 1954), pp. 224-33.

Witches.<sup>1</sup> One explanation might be that the Stationers' Company refused to enter *The Terrors of the Night* to Danter until they had seen Fenner's pamphlet and assured themselves that Nashe's did not infringe its copyright. Perhaps, in the form in which Nashe then presented it, it contained some account of the case; or had he a hand in one of the rejected pamphlets on the witches? Gabriel Harvey derided him as 'Danter's gentleman' in the same year.<sup>2</sup>

## V

Nashe need not have had a special occasion for finishing and publishing *The Terrors of the Night* in 1594, but a suitable occasion did arise in that year from events with which Nashe was clearly connected. On 16 April Ferdinando, Earl of Derby, died after ten days' illness during which he was subject to dreams and hallucinations. We find Dr. Case again as one of the physicians in charge. There were several suspicious circumstances, and some attributed the death to witchcraft. John Stow had difficulty in getting an authentic account of what happened,<sup>3</sup> but it must have been well known soon within a limited circle; for by 28 April Sir George Carey, then Nashe's patron, knew of it, believed the accusations of witchcraft, and

<sup>1</sup> E. Arber, *Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640* (London, 1875-94), ii. 633. For other references see p. 11, n. 1.

<sup>2</sup> One possible objection to this explanation of Nashe's story may be mentioned: how can we tell that another fenland manor house would not supply an equally convincing chain of coincidences with a different family? Some circumstances that narrow the search have already been named, but it was obviously not possible to examine every manor bordering the fens some sixty miles from London. One statement in *Have with you to Saffron Walden* (written in 1595) shows that Nashe did not go through the city of Cambridge to reach his destination: 'Not halfe a yeare since, comming out of *Lincolnsheire*, it was my hap to take *Cambridge* in my waye, where I had not been in sixe yeare before' (iii. 92. 17-19). If Nashe was travelling from the London direction, this would exclude most of the Cambridgeshire fens, for the normal route to the Isle of Ely, for instance, would have taken him through Cambridge. The most likely areas are, therefore, Huntingdonshire, reached by the Great North Road, where, however, most of the fenland manors then belonged to the Cottons or the Cromwells; and a few manors in Cambridgeshire, near Newmarket, and in north-west Suffolk, near Mildenhall, to which the normal route would have been the London-Norwich highway, missing Cambridge. I have not traced all the important families who occupied manor houses in these areas at this time, but of those I have examined the nearest are: Worlington Abergavenny, which belonged to Sir Edward Nevill, sixth baron Bergavenny, whose father died in February 1590 (but Nashe would not have referred to him as a mere gentleman); and Exning, or one of the other fenland manors belonging to the Cottons of Landwade, the head of which family, Sir John Cotton, died in April 1593—but at the ripe old age of eighty-one (his knighthood also disqualifies him). In either case, where are the witches? This is far from conclusive, but it may give some idea of the difficulty of finding another family that fits the circumstances so well.

<sup>3</sup> Stow, *The Annales or Generall Chronicle of England* (London, 1614), pp. 766-8, where the story is told.

was taking steps to apprehend one of the suspects.<sup>1</sup> Now that interest had been revived in such matters within the circle for which Nashe primarily wrote, he may have felt it was a suitable moment to resuscitate his pamphlet and print it. He certainly had a personal interest in the case, since the Earl of Derby, as Lord Strange, had been (by the most acceptable identification<sup>2</sup>) the *Amyntas* who was Nashe's patron in 1592 and the Lord S. to whom he dedicated *The Choise of Valentines*.

## VI

There is thus a strong probability that Nashe stayed at Conington as a guest in the house of Robert Cotton, the antiquary, in February 1593, and that he wrote part of *The Terrors of the Night* there, perhaps at the suggestion of his host, who was, or had been, suffering from melancholy. Cotton would not have stayed there for long himself because the climate was thought to be bad for his disease, and since Nashe mentions only a single month he probably did not outstay his host. But his association with Cotton may reasonably be assumed to be older than the visit.

The background of *The Terrors of the Night* is formed by Robert Cotton's illness, the story of Thomas Cotton's mysterious death, which Nashe heard about at Conington, and speculations about the malevolent powers of witches, which had been aroused by the Warboys affair. The work may have been eventually published in 1594 to meet a revival of interest in such matters called forth by the death of the Earl of Derby in similar and suspicious circumstances in April of that year.

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. MSS. Comm., Cecil MSS.* (London, 1892), iv. 517.

<sup>2</sup> *Works*, v, Supplement, pp. 15-16.



## JOHN TILLOTSON'S REVISIONS AND DRYDEN'S 'TALENT FOR ENGLISH PROSE'

By DAVID D. BROWN

CONGREVE, in his Dedication of *The Dramatick Works of John Dryden* (1717), tantalizingly records only one fragment of reminiscence of the dead poet's talk. It is not quite of the sort that might have been expected in the circumstances:

I have frequently heard him own with Pleasure, that if he had any Talent for *English Prose*, it was owing to his having often read the Writings of the great Archbishop Tillotson.

The statement, though often quoted or alluded to, has been little elucidated. Even if its authenticity be no longer questioned, it is still too readily dismissed, either (with some justice) as generous exaggeration, or (more mistakenly) as patronizing praise of a lesser contemporary, for Tillotson's prose style was recognized as a model for English writers earlier and more widely than was Dryden's. Ker rightly interpreted the remark as meaning that Dryden 'acknowledged Tillotson as his master in the art of familiar discourse',<sup>1</sup> but he did not discuss when or how the preacher's influence might have been exerted. Discerning commentators have found it difficult to account for Congreve's words: Professor Bredvold refers to 'this extraordinary explanation of Dryden's prose style',<sup>2</sup> and Professor Sutherland admits that 'Dryden has puzzled the critics' by his assertion.<sup>3</sup> Yet, surely, we ought to be prepared to believe that Dryden had some good reason for speaking of Tillotson as he did.

Professor Nichol Smith, noting that the sentence has 'given some difficulty', has suggested that it was from Tillotson that Dryden learnt to avoid ending a sentence with a preposition, and that this drew his attention to other little points affecting the turn of a phrase.<sup>4</sup> The present article begins by following this line of inquiry, and goes on to discuss some other features of Tillotson's way of writing that may have interested Dryden. My conclusions differ from Professor Nichol Smith's: I believe that Dryden could have learnt from Tillotson (or along with him) many of the subtleties of the conversational style of prose, but that the placing

<sup>1</sup> W. P. Ker (ed.), *Essays of John Dryden* (Oxford, 1900), I. xxvii.

<sup>2</sup> L. I. Bredvold, *The Intellectual Milieu of John Dryden* (Ann Arbor, 1934), p. 120.

<sup>3</sup> J. R. Sutherland, *On English Prose* (Toronto, 1957), p. 66.

<sup>4</sup> D. Nichol Smith, *John Dryden* (Cambridge, 1950), pp. 89-90.



of the preposition was not involved. These inferences are drawn mainly from the ways in which Tillotson revised the spoken versions of his sermons both before and after publication.<sup>1</sup>

Professor Nichol Smith reminds us that Dryden learnt that a sentence had better not end with a preposition 'or other unaccented monosyllable'. But is this latter point immediately relevant? True, Dryden did learn to improve the rhythm of his sentences by giving them firmer endings, and perhaps he began to do so as a result of deciding the place of the preposition; but he would not have learnt this from Tillotson, who quite often ends sentences with unaccented monosyllables. I confine myself here to the question of 'terminal prepositions' because Dryden's scruple about them was made not on rhythmical but on grammatical grounds. It was in the context of his attempt, in the 'Defence of the Epilogue to *The Conquest of Granada*' (1672), to demonstrate that Ben Jonson 'writ not correctly', that Dryden first stated that 'the preposition in the end of the sentence' was 'a fault' which he had 'but lately observed in [his] own writings'.<sup>2</sup> Much later he told Walsh that 'concluding your Sentences with prepositions . . . is not elegant'; having admitted that Walsh's style was 'easy and natural', he was 'cavilling' about the 'correctness of the English'.<sup>3</sup> He might have said the same of Tillotson. It is not altogether true that the latter's style 'is free from the colloquial placing of the preposition',<sup>4</sup> as could be shown not only from the 200 sermons published posthumously (of which at least some had been carefully rewritten by the author), but also from those that he himself sent to the press. Of particular relevance is the first volume of *Sermons Preach'd Upon Several Occasions* (1671), which, with *The Rule of Faith* (1666), was all that Tillotson had published before Dryden's reference to the placing of the preposition. In these sermons the 'terminal preposition' occurs with what seems normal frequency, as it does in Dryden's early prose such as the *Essay of Dramatic Poesy* (1668). The following instances (such as Dryden was later to correct or avoid in his own writing) are found in the first twenty pages of Tillotson's works:

. . . the customs of the Country we live in, and the will of the Prince we live under:  
This is the only refuge that the Atheist hath to fly to, when he is prest. . .  
But this is to yield what we have all this while contended for, viz. That there is a God.

<sup>1</sup> On some sources of evidence, see my article, 'The Text of John Tillotson's Sermons', *The Library*, 5th ser. xiii (1958), 18-36, which also introduces a few points relevant to the present topic.

<sup>2</sup> Ker, i. 168.

<sup>3</sup> C. E. Ward (ed.), *Letters of John Dryden* (Durham, N.C., 1942), p. 34.

<sup>4</sup> Nichol Smith, loc. cit.

And thus I have done with the *first* consideration that I propounded to speak to . . .  
 They suppose . . . an infinite empty space for the infinite little parts of this  
 matter (which they call *Atoms*) to move and play in;  
 This the Atheist can give no punctual account of;  
 . . . This conjecture (which the Atheist applauds himself most in). . . .<sup>1</sup>

These and other examples appear in every version of *The Wisdom of Being Religious*, Tillotson's first published sermon, though it was carefully re-written several times during a period of more than fifteen years—the very years, as it happens, when Dryden's prose manner was reaching its maturity. If 'the best evidence of [Dryden's] care for his style is provided by the revised edition of the *Essay Of Dramatic Poery*',<sup>2</sup> then by the same tokens Tillotson took equal pains over his. *The Wisdom of Being Religious* was first printed in 1664, having been revised and enlarged after its delivery at St. Paul's in March of that year.<sup>3</sup> In the same year appeared a second edition,<sup>4</sup> in which there are some forty little alterations, many affecting style more than content. The sermon was next included in *Sermons Preach'd Upon Several Occasions* (1671), for which Tillotson added several long paragraphs, curtailed or recast others, and made some smaller verbal alterations. There was further scrupulous correction in the second edition of this volume (1673), again in the third (1678), and yet more before the sixth (1685). In all this revision, however—much of it involving accuracy of expression—there is no indication that Tillotson was concerned about the place of the preposition. Thus in 1673 he amended 'make *that* the *Hypothesis* to live by' merely to 'make that the Principle to live by'. Neither then nor in 1678 did he alter the expression 'the' particular fitness of these two phrases to describe Religion by', although by 1685 the redundant last word has been removed. Only once in all the revisions of this sermon does he shift a preposition in the direction which Dryden was to approve;<sup>5</sup> the presence of this isolated instance amid so many neglected opportunities indicates that Tillotson did not regard the

<sup>1</sup> J. Tillotson, *The Works . . . containing Fifty Four Sermons and Discourses, . . . with The Rule of Faith* (6th edn., London, 1710), pp. 5, 11, 12, 13, 14, 18, 19. Subsequent references to Tillotson's works, unless otherwise noted, are to this volume (cited as *Fifty Four Sermons*); the first edition appeared in 1696. Quotations agree verbally with the text in the first edition of each sermon quoted, unless the differences are mentioned in the article.

<sup>2</sup> Nichol Smith, loc. cit.

<sup>3</sup> J. Tillotson, *The Wisdom of Being Religious* (London, 1664), A2<sup>v</sup> ('The Epistle Dedicatory').

<sup>4</sup> There are copies in St. Paul's Cathedral Library and the Congregational Library, London. Wing (T. 1272) does not distinguish this from the first edition (copy in the British Museum).

<sup>5</sup> 'The times the prophet complains of' (1664) becomes 'the times of which the prophet there complains' (1671).

final preposition as a 'fault'. It seems that he neither sought nor avoided the use of the colloquial construction, except to make each sentence sound easy and natural to say.

This view is corroborated by manuscript evidence, most of it a little later than Dryden's first reference to the placing of the preposition. Bodleian MS. Rawlinson E. 125 contains copies in longhand of four sermons composed between 1673 and 1677 and revised before their publication in 1678, and also autograph versions in shorthand of some sermons (preached in 1680-1) that appear, considerably revised, in the posthumously published volumes. On the evidence of this manuscript Tillotson, when preaching, would use prepositions at the end of clauses, even in conspicuous positions,<sup>1</sup> and never regarded the construction as anything to be specially avoided when rewriting the sermons for publication, even as late as 1690. Again, there is only one instance of revision in the 'correct' direction:

And this the Pharisees, who are here charged with this sin, were guilty of, in resisting the evidence of our Saviour's miracles (MS. Rawl. E. 125, f. 92)

becomes in print

And of this the *Pharisees*, who are here charged with this sin against the Holy Ghost, were notoriously guilty, in resisting the clear evidence of our Saviour's miracles. (*Fifty Four Sermons*, p. 186)

In this version, 'notoriously guilty of' would have made a more awkward cadence.<sup>2</sup> Elsewhere the revision is in the opposite direction, and Tillotson improves the rhythm by shifting the preposition away from its 'correct' place. The manuscript version, 'Not but that the best of men are guilty of many faults and infirmities, of which they have cause to repent' (MS. Rawl. E. 125, f. 46), is altered so that the last clause reads 'which they have too much cause to repent of' (*Fifty Four Sermons*, p. 175). One sentence eventually contained three examples of the colloquial form, two of them in the words (cited in italics) added between preaching and printing:

And of this the Apostle speaks . . . as being the great sin that Christians were in danger of falling into, *called in that Epistle (Heb. 12. 1) . . . the sin which Christians, by reason of the circumstances they were then in, were especially subject to.* (*Fifty Four Sermons*, p. 187; cf. MS. Rawl. E. 125, f. 96)

There are a few hints from other sources. On one hand, a pirated edition of Tillotson's sermon at the Yorkshire Feast of 1678, evidently printed verbatim from notes taken during the preaching, preserves the words 'to comply with the Church they were born in, in all reasonable and lawful things':<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For instance, he ended one sermon in the series on Matt. v. 48 with the words: 'But this I shall not now speak to' (Bodl. MS. Rawl. E. 125, f. 185).

<sup>2</sup> There may be a similar motive for the example cited above, p. 26, n. 5.

<sup>3</sup> *A Sermon Preached December 3. 1678. By a Reverend Divine of the Church of England*

the authorized text has the obvious improvement 'in which they were born and baptised' (*Fifty Four Sermons*, p. 221). On the other hand, one of Tillotson's auditory at St. Giles on 22 October 1682, taking notes of his sermon on Jer. xiii. 23, records him as saying, 'However let us not make a mock of repentance, to w<sup>ch</sup> we must all come before we dye, or better never to have been born.'<sup>1</sup> But in print the author preferred the colloquial form 'which we must all come to' (*Fifty Four Sermons*, p. 348).

In short, Dryden's debt to Tillotson has little to do with the kind of alterations made in the 1684 edition of the *Essay of Dramatic Poesy*.

Tillotson's revisions are aimed not only at 'correctness', though many of them are improvements such as a writer working at greater leisure would have made in the act of composition; the preacher's most urgent concern was the effect of the spoken word. But in transcribing the pulpit versions of his sermons for publication, and in subsequent revision, Tillotson gave special attention to considerations appropriate only to the reader: the spoken discourse is made into literature. In *Sermons Preach'd Upon Several Occasions* (1671) the eight items have been carefully selected and arranged to read like chapters in a book, yet without sacrificing the illusion that they are a transcript of speech. Having inserted a quite new argument, Tillotson adds 'But this I shall not now insist upon, because I design a particular discourse of that by itself' (*Fifty Four Sermons*, p. 22), as if the words had been spoken in 1664 and the discourse mentioned (Sermon III) was then being composed, though in fact it was probably not preached until 1667.<sup>2</sup> He would curtail his original exegesis of the scriptural text, so as to introduce more quickly the propositions which fall into the scheme of the book.<sup>3</sup> He moved with secular fashion in deleting many of the Latin tags and learned references which had been the expected adornments of the pulpit oration but might now smack of pedantry. For this volume and in other sermons both before and after publication, he would alter statements so as to safeguard an intended meaning or to make a cautious modification.<sup>4</sup>

(n.p., 1679), p. 22. The edition is not recorded in Wing. There is a copy in Dr. Williams's Library, London.

<sup>1</sup> National Library of Wales MS. 1484 E, p. 29. The notes are an almost complete transcript of the sermon, and mostly agree closely with the printed text.

<sup>2</sup> The copy of the sermon in Bodl. MS. Rawl. E. 19 contains an allusion to 'Gods terrible judgments, which of late have beene so many and so grievous upon us' (f. 90)—i.e. the Plague and the Great Fire—so that the following words about 'Peace both at home and abroad' appear to refer to the ending of the Dutch War, not the Civil War as at *Fifty Four Sermons*, p. 49.

<sup>3</sup> This process is clear from a comparison of Sermon II (*Fifty Four Sermons*, pp. 34-42) with the notes made by Joseph Keble of Gray's Inn when Tillotson preached there on 2 May 1669 (Bodl. MS. Rawl. E. 208, pp. 62-69).

<sup>4</sup> E.g. instead of 'the blessed' (MS. Rawl. E. 125, f. 40b) he wrote 'the persons here spoken of' (*Fifty Four Sermons*, p. 173) to make clear that he meant the angels, not

More significant is the dexterous insertion of words which help to preserve for the reader the continuity of thought or the gradation of emphasis that would have been conveyed to the hearer merely by variations of the speaking voice. Tillotson's skill in this respect developed throughout his career. As early as 1664 he became alert to the reader's need of such unobtrusive guidance; into the second edition of *The Wisdom of Being Religious* he began to insert such words as 'likewise', 'therefore', 'then', and continued the process in later revisions.<sup>1</sup> Again, loosenesses and ambiguities which would have passed undetected by his hearers were amended by slight grammatical alterations like the changing of a verb from plural to singular or of a carelessly related participial phrase into a clause or sentence. Signs of this awareness appear in the 1664 revisions; they are more frequent in those of 1671 and 1673, and even more in the posthumous editions of those sermons of 1680 that survive in Tillotson's shorthand autograph. To avoid lengthy quotation, I select a single typical point, the care he learned to take over the precise reference of pronouns and demonstratives. In the following examples from the second edition of *The Wisdom of Being Religious* (pp. 13, 24, 27) the italicized words replace respectively *this*, *which*, *him*, in the original edition:

... what I have said in the direct proof of *the Proposition* ...

... *because the opinion of the vulgar* separated from the Consent and Approbation of the Wise ...

Why if God should carry *this perverse man* out ...

In the following, the italicized words replace respectively *this*, *it*, *this sin*, found in the pulpit versions (Bodl. MS. Rawl. E. 125, ff. 36, 61, 98):

At this the Pharisees were displeased, and murmured, and *this unreasonable murmuring of theirs* gave occasion to the three parables in this chapter.

I see no great reason for *this temper and carriage* ...

... Which signifies that *the sin there spoken of* is more immediately committed against the Holy Spirit of God. (*Fifty Four Sermons*, pp. 172, 178, 187)

Tillotson realized quite early in his literary career that one cannot safely transcribe into print every turn of phrase that might be effective when suitably uttered. Some of his 1664 revisions consist simply of the removal

departed souls. In *The Wisdom of Being Religious* at various dates he inserted 'perhaps' and 'often', and altered 'always' to 'usually', 'not ... above three to four at most' to 'hardly ... above five or six', 'no man ... can doubt' to 'there is no man ... but must be inclined to think', and so on.

<sup>1</sup> For further instances of this kind of 'signposting' inserted between preaching and publication, see Brown, *Library* (1958), pp. 34-36.



of colloquial remarks which seem facetious or feeble when recorded. The original ending of *The Wisdom of Being Religious* was:

If men will choose to be fools, and to be miserable, all that can be said is this, that God will leave such persons to inherit their own choice, to enjoy the portion of sinners: and much good may it do them, but I am sure it will not.

The second edition ends at 'sinners'; and by 1671 Tillotson had also replaced 'all that can be said is this'. At other points he altered 'can say Amen to [such a heap of absurdities]' to 'can assent to', and 'the Atheist layes a wager' to 'the Atheist contends'. Anyone who has had to put into writing something originally conceived as spoken language knows that the faithful reproduction of colloquialisms may give a false impression of the tone. Thus in Tillotson's 'Yorkshire Feast' sermon, the words 'because they do not believe' are more appropriate for the reader than 'because forsooth they don't believe', which the pirated edition reports him to have said. On another occasion the preacher, imitating the voice of the sinner trying to justify his way of life, said something like 'he cant think thers so much reason ag<sup>t</sup> w<sup>t</sup> he has a fansie to' (Nat. Libr. of Wales MS. 1484 E, p. 27); the reader meets the words in the form 'he cannot think that there should be so much reason against those things for which he hath so strong an affection' (*Fifty Four Sermons*, p. 343). Each version is effective in its setting. That Tillotson as a writer was handling a delicate task may be realized if one looks at the printed work of other preachers of his day; some of the best, such as Stillingfleet, cannot altogether avoid stiffness, and on the other hand, Hiceringill's notorious *Curse Ye Meroz* (1680), printed exactly as it was delivered, has an entirely colloquial vigour that precludes most of the graces of literary prose. Tillotson, like Dryden, tries to find a course between two extremes. It is his awareness of the differences between spoken and written language that enables him often to achieve the effect of the former while using the medium of the latter. With a skill that has deceived later critics,<sup>1</sup> Tillotson was courteously and subtly attentive to the impression that the reader would receive of his tone of voice.

The famed lucidity of Tillotson's sermons is due not only to their orderly design, but also in part to the articulation of the sentences, which Burnet described as 'short and clear', adding more pertinently that 'the whole Thread was of a piece, plain and distinct'.<sup>2</sup> The component sense-groups, each simple enough to be comprehended as it occurs, are linked

<sup>1</sup> Gosse, *A History of Eighteenth Century Literature* (London, 1889), p. 89, calls Tillotson's ease that of 'a fluent improvisator'; G. Sampson, *Concise Cambridge History of English Literature* (Cambridge, 1941), p. 441, says that he 'had the extempore manner'. In fact he would write out every word before preaching.

<sup>2</sup> G. Burnet, *A Sermon Preached at the Funeral of . . . John [Tillotson]* (London, 1694), p. 13.

coherently, but without apparent artifice. The resultant structure, usually loose but seldom straggling, allows frequent resting-points instead of keeping the attention tautly stretched for long periods; yet the artful variety of Tillotson's sentence patterns can still please modern readers.<sup>1</sup> He knew that a succession of short simple sentences which would hold the attention of the hearer might be fatiguing to read, and that the reader could appreciate periods which a hearer might find confusing. Someone listening to him in 1682 wrote down:

Som by resoluti<sup>n</sup> have masterd great difficulties. It was by this y<sup>t</sup> Socrates overcame y<sup>e</sup> hastiness of his temper; & Demosthenes y<sup>e</sup> natural impedim<sup>t</sup> of his speech; and both came therby to great mastery. (Nat. Libr. of Wales MS. 1484 E, p. 28)

The corresponding passage as printed in 1686 runs:

Some by an obstinate resolution, and taking incredible pains with themselves, have mastered great natural vices and defects: as Socrates and Demosthenes; who almost exceeded all mankind in those two things for which by nature they seemed to be least made, and most unfit; one in governing of his passions, and the other in the mighty force and power of his eloquence. (*Fifty Four Sermons*, p. 364)

If the latter version had been spoken in the pulpit, it may be doubted whether the note-taker would have been able to record the gist of the sentence so accurately while rearranging it; elsewhere his manuscript corresponds closely with the word-order of the printed sermon. Tillotson either paraphrased his script when preaching, or recast the spoken version into a more patterned form when he came to publish it. Even so, it remains, like all Tillotson's writings, conveniently speakable. His feeling for the natural cadences of speech may explain why sometimes the order of pairs of words as found in the Bodleian autograph is reversed in print; 'accidents and attempts' becomes 'attempts and accidents', for instance. Such changes, avoiding too long a succession of unstressed syllables or giving a better distribution of emphasis, again indicate just so much conscious art as improves a sentence without destroying the semblance of spontaneity.

Other textual changes show that Tillotson, like Dryden, cared about purity of diction. Though it was characteristic of his thinking to blur the distinctions between precise theological terms in attempting to establish some large truth, he remained alert to niceties of meaning within the range of the average man's vocabulary, to which he carefully confined himself. The language of his preaching was that of his hearers—especially the lawyers and merchants of London—in their everyday concerns. There are some signs, as early as the 1671 revision of *The Wisdom of Being Religious*, that he shared and attempted to act upon the desire of Wilkins and the

<sup>1</sup> See W. Somerset Maugham, *Points of View* (London, 1959), p. 101.

Royal Society for a language in which each word would carry a single unequivocal meaning. Such attempts, though not a direct influence upon Dryden, would have been of interest to him in his search for words not only 'sounding' but 'apt' and 'significant'.<sup>1</sup> Tillotson kept abreast of current usage; in 1680, realizing that 'secure' might be misunderstood, he pointed a distinction: 'In the midst of danger a man may be secure but he only is safe who is out of danger'.<sup>2</sup> Where an obsolescent meaning might mislead, he would alter his script, as in replacing 'apparent evidence' (Bodl. MS. Rawl. E. 125, f. 82) by 'undeniable evidence'. Any difficult or unfamiliar word is usually placed in a context in which it can be readily understood; 'propension', for instance, is paired with 'disposition' (ibid., f. 196). Tillotson's diction was soon recognized as a norm for good prose. Locke recommended his works as pre-eminent among those 'allowed to be writ with the greatest clearness and propriety, in the language that a man uses';<sup>3</sup> in 1698 Hughes, taking general acceptance as the criterion for propriety of language, could point out as models not only the best conversation of the time but also writers like Tillotson.<sup>4</sup> Later his works were admitted as a suitable basis for the dictionaries projected by Addison and Pope,<sup>5</sup> and for Johnson's.

Hughes gives another reason for commending the Archbishop as a model for young writers: 'an Easiness and beautiful Simplicity in all his Expressions, which every one that reads him is apt to think may be imitated without much Difficulty, and yet nothing perhaps is so hard in the Experiment'.<sup>6</sup> That Tillotson's apparently effortless ease and simplicity were indeed the product of painstaking craftsmanship can be seen in two final illustrations. One is the opening of *The Wisdom of Being Religious* in its successive printed forms. In the first edition the sermon begins thus, after the announcement of the text (Job xxviii. 28):

In the beginning of this chapter *Job* discourseth of the knowledg of Nature, and of secret and unaccountable operations of Natural Causes, and of the unsearchable perfections of the Works of God.

The preacher summarizes the chapter by quoting and paraphrasing key verses, ending

*God understandeth the way thereof, and he knoweth the place thereof, for he looketh*

<sup>1</sup> Ker, i. 13 (Preface to *Annus Mirabilis*).

<sup>2</sup> Bodl. MS. Rawl. E. 125, f. 203. The sermon is unpublished.

<sup>3</sup> J. A. St. John (ed.), *The Works of John Locke* (London, 1871), p. 499 ('Some Thoughts Concerning Reading and Study').

<sup>4</sup> J. Hughes, 'Of Style', in W. H. Durham (ed.), *Critical Essays of the Eighteenth Century* (London, 1915), p. 80.

<sup>5</sup> T. Birch, 'The Life of the Author' in *The Works of . . . Tillotson* (London, 1752), i. c; S. W. Singer (ed.), Spence's *Anecdotes* (London, 1820), pp. 291, 310.

<sup>6</sup> 'Of Style', pp. 84-85.

*to the ends of the earth, and seeth under the whole heaven to make the weight for the wind &c.* A perfect knowledge of nature is nowhere to be found but in the Author of it. . . .

In the second edition Tillotson, realizing that this last sentence must be recognizable as a summarizing gloss of his own and not read as a continuation of the exposition, inserted after the biblical quotation the words "The result of which discourse is, 'That' [a perfect knowledge &c.]. In 1671 the account of the biblical context was omitted, and the sermon simply begins: 'In this Chapter *Job* discourseth of the secrets of Nature, and the unsearchable perfections of the works of *God*. And the result of his discourse is, that a perfect knowledge . . .'. But even then the beginning of this second sentence did not quite satisfy the writer. Only in 1678 did he achieve its final yet seemingly spontaneous form: 'And the result of his discourse is this, 'That a perfect knowledge . . .'. First had come the recognition of the reader's need for a 'signpost', and then the successive changes towards a more idiomatic English construction.

Now here are the original and the final versions of a passage later in the sermon; the differences are characteristic.

1664

And that the finite measure and capacity of our understandings is not able to take in and comprehend the infinite excellencies and perfections of God, this indeed shews the excellency of the object, but doth not at all detract from the delightfulness of the knowledge; for it is a greater pleasure for a finite understanding to be lost in the contemplation of its object, and to view unlimited excellencies, which have no shore or bounds, then to look upon those perfections of which we can see the end and utmost; as 'tis more pleasant to the eye to have an endless prospect, then to be terminated.

1671

And that the finite measure and capacity of our understandings is not able to take in and comprehend the infinite perfections of God, this indeed shews the excellency of the object, but doth not altogether take away the delightfulness of the knowledge. For as it is pleasant to the Eye to have an endless prospect, so is it some pleasure to a finite understanding to view unlimited excellencies which have no shore nor bounds, though it cannot comprehend them. (*Fifty Four Sermons*, p. 4)

Tillotson's detailed and purposeful revision of his sermons for a reading public cannot be paralleled, as far as I know, in the work of any of his confrères. Many eminent preachers (Sancroft and Dolben, for instance) cared little about publication; others would load their sermons with learned annotations; Patrick would inflate his into larger books; Burnet preached extempore or from brief notes and wrote his works out later. We need

further evidence about the practice of men like South, Glanvill, Sprat, and Lloyd. But fortunately—since we are trying to trace an acknowledged debt—it is possible to see what Tillotson did as a writer. His revisions are not those of a conscious stylist working within a settled convention such as that of the 'witty' sermon, nor of a writer trying, like Glanvill,<sup>1</sup> to recast his ideas in a quite different style. Rather, we may detect one stage—perhaps a decisive one—in the evolution of a prose which derived less from traditional literary patterns than from the speech of the average educated Englishman. Others, of course, were working along the same lines as Tillotson, but few quite so deliberately or so early. Halifax's *Character of King Charles II* (written about 1685) has been taken to exemplify the 'slightly formalised variation of the conversation of gentlemen'<sup>2</sup> which characterizes the best Restoration prose. Half a generation earlier, Tillotson was attempting a similar variation of conversational modes at a different social level. If 'a tradition in prose . . . style first takes shape when a body of critical opinion crystallises around the idiomatic structure of the language', at a point when 'it is realized that [many] influences have resulted in an appropriateness, in a fit relation of sound, sense and conversational ease',<sup>3</sup> then Tillotson has a place in the tradition by being among the first to achieve this appropriateness. It was upon his kind of prose, which fulfils the requirements of Wilkins's *Ecclesiastes* as well as those of his *Real Character*, and exemplifies in advance the qualities advocated by Eachard, Arderne, and Glanvill, that there crystallized the critical opinions of writers, both laymen and divines, who took a pride in the propriety of their style.

Tillotson's writings obviously have many qualities of which Dryden must have approved. They combine lucidity with that feeling for English idiom which Dryden valued so long as it did not conceal 'nonsense couched under that specious name of Anglicism';<sup>4</sup> and they conform closely to conversational standards, using the language of artisans and merchants without adopting either that of countrymen (which would be 'clownish') or that of wits and scholars. Tillotson's deliberate avoidance of pedantry has been mentioned above: equally notable is his rejection of wit in the older sense of the tropes and figures of the 'metaphysical' style of preaching. His whole works contain scarcely an example of the 'clenches' or puns which Dryden regarded as false wit, and which still found 'benefit of

<sup>1</sup> See R. F. Jones, *The Seventeenth Century* (Stanford, 1951), pp. 89-97.

<sup>2</sup> J. R. Sutherland, in *Restoration and Augustan Prose* (Los Angeles, 1957), pp. 5, 6. R. Gathorne-Hardy, *The Library*, xiv (1959), 117-23, has shown that a hitherto unnoticed manuscript of *The Character of a Trimmer* at Ickworth, 'together with the first edition of 1688, gives evidence of a more laborious art than has been credited to Halifax'.

<sup>3</sup> H. Read, *English Prose Style* (London, new edn. 1952), p. 203.

<sup>4</sup> Dedication of *Troilus and Cressida* (1679). See G. Williamson, *The Senecan Amble* (London, 1951), p. 327.



clergy' for some years after the Restoration.<sup>1</sup> Again, Tillotson concurred, both in his practice and in his theory, with Dryden's view that the function of metaphor and figure in prose was strictly limited. Admittedly the preacher's fancy was much less luxuriant than the poet's, and had little need of being bounded; but on principle also he was as suspicious of 'this trick of metaphor' as the Royal Society and its historian, or as Dryden professed to be in his jibe at Howard, 'I am almost fearful of illustrating anything by similitude, lest he should confute it for an argument' (Ker, i. 129). Tillotson was more seriously cautious:

Indeed after a man hath delivered the simple notion of a thing in proper words, he may afterwards illustrate it by metaphors: but then these are not to be insisted upon, and strained to the utmost extent of the metaphor, beyond what the true notion of the thing will bear: for if consequences once come to be drawn from metaphors, and doctrines founded, and theories built upon them, instead of illustrating the thing, they blind and obscure it and serve to no other purpose, but to seduce and mislead the understandings of men, and to multiply controversies without end.<sup>2</sup>

In these respects the reading of Tillotson's writings would only have confirmed Dryden's own opinions and practice.

Indeed who would have noticed Dryden's indebtedness at all if he had not pointed to it himself? The characteristic qualities by which he still delights his readers, and which appear even in his earliest prose, belong not to style alone but to his ideas, interests, and thought, for which he can owe little to Tillotson. What we must ask is whether Dryden's later writing shows any development for which Tillotson could have provided a hint. The question hardly admits of a decisive answer, but I proffer two observations; though not capable of exact demonstration or conclusive proof, they will fit in with the supposition (which Dryden's reported admission would suggest) that there was a fairly close literary and personal connexion between the two men.

The first is that Tillotson's writing has a consistency of tone and assurance of manner that is lacking in Dryden's earliest prose. The latter's style until about 1671, for all its vivacity and charm, has an occasional awkwardness and formality, as if the writer were still conscious of being the 'parvenu' among the nobility whom he was then addressing. The Epistle Dedicatory of *The Rival Ladies* (1664), with its overburdened sentences in the first paragraph, and that of the *Essay of Dramatic Poesy* (1668), with its reiterated 'your Lordship', have not the confident, easy, mature manner

<sup>1</sup> Ker, i. 173-4. See also Williamson, p. 331; and, for Tillotson on wit, *Fifty Four Sermons*, pp. 40-41.

<sup>2</sup> Tillotson, *Works* (London, 1752), iii. 463. The passage is from the posthumously published sermons and cannot be exactly dated. On Dryden's view of metaphor in prose, see Williamson, p. 325.

of, say, the Dedication of *The Spanish Friar* (1681), which, as Dryden lightly confesses, 'looks more like a Preface'. Dedications, of course, had a conventional style, such as Dryden adopts in presenting *Annus Mirabilis* to the City of London; but something of the same studied balance is carried over into the accompanying letter to Howard:

Sir,

I am so many ways obliged to you, and so little able to return your favours, that, like those who owe too much, I can only live by getting farther into your debt. You have not only been careful of my fortune, which was the effect of your nobleness, but you have been solicitous of my reputation, which is that of your kindness. . . .

Only gradually is the looser, more conversational mode established. Even in the *Essay of Dramatic Poesy*, the talk of the gentlemen seems sometimes to have been thought out and polished a little in advance of its utterance. On the other hand, the *Defence of the Essay* has an affected and uneasy negligence of manner. It took Dryden some years to achieve just the right 'compromise between the casual and the formal, the foreseen and the fortuitous'.<sup>1</sup> Tillotson, however, seems to have found it almost at once. Against the Dedication of *Annus Mirabilis* set the Epistle Dedicatory of *The Wisdom of Being Religious* (1664), addressed to the same worshipful body, or the dignified but unaffected little epistle dedicating *Sermons Preach'd Upon Several Occasions* (1671) to the Society of Lincoln's Inn:

Gentlemen,

When I first resolved to publish these Sermons, I could have no dispute with myself to whom to dedicate them. They do of right belong to you, not only as being (most of them) first preach'd among you; but likewise upon the account of my great obligations to you for the constant respects you have been pleas'd to express towards me, ever since I had the honour and happiness to be related to you, both by the favourable acceptance and the generous encouragement which my labours have found among you. In a grateful acknowledgement wherof, I humbly present this small part of them to you, and shall for ever Own and endeavour to approve my self

Your most obliged and  
faithful Servant,  
JOHN TILLOTSON<sup>2</sup>

In any of Tillotson's writing—dedications, sermons, letters—it is the same voice that one hears, equable, courteous, unaffected, confident. What establishes the tone of a man's writing is the awareness of a settled

<sup>1</sup> Sutherland, in *Restoration and Augustan Prose*, p. 6.

<sup>2</sup> Comparison with the final version (in *Fifty Four Sermons*, sig. A1) will again show what improvement Tillotson could effect by re-arranging words and phrases even within an informal style.

relationship with his audience or public, such as Tillotson derived from his sacred office; knowing how he stood with his hearers and readers, he knew how to start speaking to them. Dryden began less securely. The first piece of his writing that maintains a consistent and assured tone is the Preface to *An Evening's Love* (1671); significantly, it is also the first to be addressed directly and explicitly to the reader. Only from this date is Dryden's prose 'intended for the greatest number [and] meant to be popular'.<sup>1</sup> It is just at this point, when Dryden was learning to appeal to the general educated public, that Tillotson's manner would have afforded him an acceptable model.

The second observation is suggested by the fact that whereas in his early critical work Dryden twice mentioned the 'negligence of prose' (with particular reference to the order of words),<sup>2</sup> he was later to speak of having long studied and practised its harmony.<sup>3</sup> He learnt that good conversational prose is not written negligently; that it will not suffice to write as one speaks—or even (since Dryden was not a ready conversationalist) to write as one would wish to speak. The ordering of words and phrases within a sentence, the subtle emphasizing of salient points, the right length and shape of sentences and paragraphs, all need careful management. Though, in the words of Johnson's famous tribute, every word must *seem* to drop by chance, it must fall into its proper place. Dryden's skill in this developed, I think, as Tillotson's did. The Preface to *Troilus and Cressida* (1679) exemplifies his mastery of the appropriate method, not only in its tone, but also in subtle details of expression: its unobtrusive orderliness of progress, its careful placing of such guiding words and phrases as 'Thus', 'yet', 'after all', 'tis true', 'I therefore proceed to . . .', 'To speak justly of this whole matter', and the artfully easy sentence beginning 'The difference between Shakespeare and Fletcher in their plotting seems to be this', with that skilful pause before the introduction of the main point. These little features are just the kind of thing that Tillotson took trouble to introduce between preaching and publication. It may be presumed (for we have no documentary evidence) that Dryden achieved his apparently spontaneous conversational manner in prose only after similar careful rewriting.

Not only do we lack manuscripts of Dryden's prose; we know curiously little of his life, and there is not one firmly established piece of evidence about his relations with Tillotson. Until any be found, we can proceed only by inference and reasonable conjecture. With this in mind, I now try to gather together some atoms of probability. By 1672 both men had

<sup>1</sup> Ker, i. xxvii.

<sup>2</sup> Ker, i. 7 (Dedication of *The Rival Ladies*), and i. 98 (*Essay of Dramatic Poesy*).

<sup>3</sup> Ker, ii. 249 (Preface to the *Fables*).

faced the problem of writing prose at once clear, correct, easy, and of general appeal. It is likely that before then Dryden had been to Lincoln's Inn Chapel, near his house, and had heard Tillotson preach. He may well have known him personally: Tillotson's father-in-law, John Wilkins, was a leading member of the Royal Society during the period of the poet's membership, and had been especially asked to attend the first meeting of the committee (on which Dryden also served) for improving the English language; the two younger men, almost the same age, could easily have met in Wilkins's company during the mid-1660's. By 1671 both were in attendance at the Court, Tillotson being then one of His Majesty's Chaplains in Ordinary. There are grounds for believing that they were on terms of some intimacy ten years later, and that the cleric who read *Religio Laici* before its publication in 1682 was Tillotson.<sup>1</sup> If he knew Dryden well enough to be shown such a poem in manuscript, it is probable that the relationship was reciprocal, and that Dryden had seen some of Tillotson's sermons before publication; he would not have been the only one to do so. Dryden, who noted in 1672 that preachers were 'commonly the first corrupters of eloquence',<sup>2</sup> would have been glad that one of the most eminent of the younger clergy<sup>3</sup> was leading a reformation from 'vicious oratory', and one might reasonably expect Dryden to have discussed naturalness of style with a contemporary who was interested in finding literary expression for the new 'plain' preaching. Such preachers (unlike most other writers in a plain style) were compelled to consider the problem of making their words effective first in speech and afterwards for the critical reader, and in this double respect few men achieved greater fame than Tillotson.<sup>4</sup>

I suggest, then, that when Dryden spoke of having learnt a great deal about English prose from reading Tillotson's writings, he meant that besides studying the printed works he had seen manuscript sermons of the famous preacher (probably during the late 1660's and early 1670's) and talked with the author about what needed to be done in preparing them for a reading public: how to make speech into prose, and prose sound like talk. Tillotson's scrupulous concern with niceties of rhythm, tone,

<sup>1</sup> The identification, proposed by Professor Nichol Smith (*John Dryden*, p. 88), is supported in my note, 'Dryden's *Religio Laici* and the "judicious and learned friend"', *M.L.R.*, lvi (1961), 66-69.

<sup>2</sup> Ker, i. 174 (Defence of the Epilogue to *The Conquest of Granada*).

<sup>3</sup> Tillotson and Stillingfleet were so regarded in 1663, according to Burnet's 'Autobiography'. See H. C. Foxcroft (ed.), *Supplement to Burnet's History* (Oxford, 1902), p. 463.

<sup>4</sup> Joseph Glanvill's manuscript *Bensalem*, written before 1676, refers to 'Tonsillo (Tillotson) as 'esteem'd greatly for the Solidity and Plainness of his Discourses' and suggests that he had a considerable literary reputation on the strength of *The Rule of Faith* and one 'volume of Judicious Sermons': see L. G. Locke, *Tillotson* (Copenhagen, 1954), p. 173.

diction, emphasis, and syntax may have served to focus Dryden's more acute critical attention on some of the technical problems of English prose style.

The hypothesis that Dryden's debt was incurred partly through discussion of unpublished writing would obviate two conspicuous difficulties that have troubled commentators hitherto. First, the assumption of a personal link between the two men provides the most natural explanation of the warmth of Dryden's acknowledgement. Secondly, it no longer matters so much that Tillotson's published work up to 1672 (or even 1678) seems too small in bulk to have exerted much influence on Dryden's style, for in the scrutiny of detail before publication the exchange of seminal ideas would be more important than the particular examples discussed, and would reinforce the subsequent effect of the printed page.

One may still wonder why it was this particular remark that Congreve chose to record in his Dedication rather than so much else that he must have heard Dryden say. The sentences preceding it suggest an explanation:

He was equally excellent in Verse, and in Prose. His Prose had all the Clearness imaginable, together with all the Nobleness of Expression; all the Graces and Ornaments proper and peculiar to it, without deviating into the Language or Diction of Poetry. I make this Observation, only to distinguish his Stile from that of many Poetical Writers, who meaning to write harmoniously in Prose, do in truth often write meer Blank Verse.

The qualities here attributed to Dryden are just those of which Tillotson was then held to be a model—clearness, dignity, propriety of diction—for Tillotson's work needed no commendation to the public of 1717.<sup>1</sup> Congreve seems to be claiming new readers for Dryden on the ground that his prose is akin to that of the famous Archbishop—clear, 'proper', unaffected—rather than to that of fellow-poets, who when trying to write a stylish prose could not avoid 'artificial' rhythms and diction. He may even have been including himself among writers of the latter kind, meaning that a distaste for his own style should not prejudice potential readers against that of his old friend. Certainly, he is referring to Tillotson's work as an accepted standard of excellence in prose, and it may be doubted whether many of his original readers would have found Dryden's acknowledgement 'extraordinary' or 'puzzling'. The Archbishop's writings are unlikely ever again to stand in such esteem. Yet when he died, it was not unjustly said of him that 'no Man knew better the Art of preserving the Majesty of things under a Simplicity of Words'.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In that year there appeared a handsome second edition of the two folio volumes of the posthumous sermons, which had already had many octavo editions. *Fifty Four Sermons* had reached its seventh edition. On Tillotson's reputation in the eighteenth century, see L. G. Locke, pp. 131-63.

<sup>2</sup> Burnet, *Funeral Sermon*, p. 13.



## SHELLEY AND JANE WILLIAMS

By G. M. MATTHEWS

THE lyric known as 'Lines written in the Bay of Lerici' was recovered from manuscript, and given its title, by Richard Garnett, who published his discovery twice in 1862, first in the June issue of *Macmillan's Magazine* and again the same year in his own *Relics of Shelley*. Later editors, naturally supposing the *Relics* text to be a revision of the *Macmillan's*, have always followed the former, although in fact this is a corrupted and not an emended version. The manuscript of the 'Lines' is among the loose sheets of *The Triumph of Life* in the Bodleian Library,<sup>1</sup> where it fills all four pages of its own separate sheet—a folio folded into quarto—of the same paper used for most of the *Triumph*, a material resembling a poor-quality typing-paper. A short name at line 28 of the full text, heavily and decoratively obliterated except for its initial, 'J', confirms what most readers have already agreed, that the poem is about Jane Williams.<sup>2</sup> Nor is there reason to question the aptness of Garnett's title: the 'Lines' were evidently composed on the west coast of Italy in the spring or early summer of 1822, and the symbolic use of the rock-fisher in lines 51-54 recalls the entries in Williams's journal for 2 May and 4 May, and for 11 June ('Sailed in the evening and fished on the rocks till 10—no sport').<sup>3</sup>

There is, however, another likely reason for Garnett's choice of the word 'Lines' in his title for the poem. Also in *Relics of Shelley*, as no. XL of 'Miscellaneous Fragments', appeared the following five and a half lines, dated 1822 (reprinted as 'Fragment: to the Moon' on p. 675 of Hutchinson's Oxford text):

Bright wanderer, fair coquette of heaven,  
To whom alone it has been given  
To change and be adored for ever,  
Envy not this dim world, for never  
But once within its shadow grew  
One fair as —.

The manuscript shows that this fragment is really the opening of 'Lines written in the Bay of Lerici', prefixed by cramping into a narrow space at the head of the page, so that its last line all but runs into the first line of the

<sup>1</sup> Bodl. MS. Shelley adds. c. 4, ff. 35-36<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> F. 35<sup>v</sup>: *And I was happy J[ane]*

<sup>3</sup> *Maria Gisborne and Edward E. Williams: Their Journals and Letters*, ed. F. L. Jones (Norman, Oklahoma, 1951), pp. 146-7, 154.

main poem. Clearly, the fragment and the 'Lines' were composed separately; but equally clearly they belong together. Unless Shelley had meant the fragment to begin the 'Lines' there could have been no point in so compressing it, since even if the rest of the draft was already complete he could have found comfortable space for it on the bottom half of f. 36<sup>r</sup>. The same ink is used for fragment and poem. Moreover, the last three lines of the main poem on f. 36<sup>r</sup> are widely spaced in order to accommodate what was evidently an original cancelled opening, written the other way up:

*She left me when the moon was  
The moon was*

so that he was undecided from the outset which to begin with, Jane Williams or the moon. In any case, the fair but changeable and vanishing moon, the fair, unchanging but vanished Jane, and the 'delusive flame' of the fisherman's lamp make an imaginative whole that is alone sufficient to establish the unity of the two pieces. Garnett probably recognized this, but being uncertain of the concluding words of the fragment, and unwilling to spoil a prize, began his version at line 7 and tacitly admitted its incompleteness by calling the poem 'Lines' and printing the fragment separately. No doubt it was for the same reason that he added a plausible verb, 'leaves', to the penultimate line of the main poem for which there is no authority in the holograph. (Locock commented: 'The rhyming of the final couplet is a license, even for Shelley'.<sup>1</sup>)

The complete poem, reproduced by courtesy of the Delegates of the Clarendon Press, is given below exactly as Shelley wrote it. Altogether it differs in 62 instances from the text of *Macmillan's Magazine*, and in 68 from the text of *Relics of Shelley*—the source of all subsequent texts. Every significant verbal difference from Garnett's two texts (referred to as *MM* and *R* respectively) is recorded, together with the more interesting cancellations in italics; but the numerous minor variations of pointing, capitalization, &c., are not noticed.

f. 35 <sup>r</sup>	Bright wanderer, fair coquette of Heaven,	1
	To whom alone it has been given	
	To change & be adored for ever . . .	
	Envy not this dim world, for never	
	But once within its shadow grew	5
	One fair as you, but far more true	
	She left me at the silent time	
	When the moon had ceased to climb	
	The azure dome of Heaven's steep	
	And like an albatross asleep	10

<sup>1</sup> *The Poems of Percy Bysshe Shelley*, ed. C. D. Locock (London, 1911), ii. 530.

	Balanced on her wings of light	
	Hovered in the purple night—	
	Ere she sought her Ocean nest,	
	In the chambers of the west.—	
	She left me, and I staid alone	15
	Thinking over every tone,	
	Which though now silent to the ear	
	The enchanted heart could hear	
	Like notes which die when born, but still	
	Haunt the echoes of the hill:	20
	And feeling ever—o too much	
	The soft vibrations of her touch	
	As if her gentle hand even now	
	Lightly trembled on my brow	
f. 35 <sup>v</sup>	And thus although she absent were	25
	Memory gave me all of her	
	That even fancy dares to claim.—	
	Her presence had made weak & tame	
	All passions, and I lived alone	
	In the time which is our own;	30
	The past & future were forgot	
	As they had been, & would be, not.—	
	But soon, the guardian angel gone	
	The demon reassumed his throne	
f. 36 <sup>r</sup>	In my faint heart . . . I dare not speak	35
	My thoughts; but thus disturbed & weak	
	I sate and watched the vessels glide	
	Along the Ocean bright & wide	
	Like spirit winged chariots sent	
	O'er some serenest element	40
	For ministrations strange & far;	
	As if to some Elysian star	
	They sailed for drink to medicine	
	Such sweet & bitter pain as mine.—	
	And the wind that winged their flight	45
	From the land came fresh & light	
f. 36 <sup>v</sup>	And the scent of sleeping flowers	
	And the coolness of the hours	
	Of dew, & the sweet warmth of day	
	Was scattered o'er the twinkling bay	50
	And the fisher with his lamp	
	And spear, about the low rocks damp	
	Crept, and struck the fish who came	
	To worship the delusive flame	
	Too happy, they whose pleasure sought	55

Extinguishes all sense & thought  
 Of the regret that pleasure  
 Seeking Life alone not peace.

- 1-6 Omitted *MM*; printed as no. XL of 'Miscellaneous Fragments' *R*.  
 These lines were evidently drafted apart from the rest, and had to be squeezed in later at the head of the page.

6 One fair as — *R*.

9 dome] path *MM*, *R*.

17 Which, though silent to the ear, *R*.

22 vibrations] vibration *MM*, *R*.

25-26 First written: And thus contented with a lot  
*Which others, who have suffered not,*

29 These 'passions' were specified before cancellation as *Desire & fear*.

33 First written: *But now I desired,—I dare not*

37 sate and watched] sat and watched *MM* sat and saw *R*.

38 Over the ocean bright and wide, *MM*; so also *R*, without comma.

43 Sailed for drink to medicine *MM*, *R*.

46 Between 46 and 47 these cancelled lines were drafted:

*So that on the sifted sand  
 Which divided sea & land  
 Like a thread of moonlight lay  
 On the disentangled spray*

47 sleeping flowers] winged flowers *R*.

49 & the sweet warmth of day] and sweet warmth left by day *MM*; so also *R*, with final comma.

50 Was] Were *MM*, *R*. The verb was unnecessarily emended through neglect of Shelley's punctuation.

53 who] which *MM*, *R*.

54 *worship* is cancelled in MS., and the first letter, 'g' ('g[aze on?])' of a substitute written above.

55 Too happy they, whose pleasure sought *MM*; so also *R*, with final comma.

57 that pleasure leaves, *MM*, *R*. This incomplete line is written in a different ink from the rest of the poem.

58 Destroying life alone, not peace! *MM*, *R*. *Destroying* is firmly cancelled in MS., with a space before the next word, and probably had no connexion with the rest of the line as it stands: 'destroying' would go with 'regret' and the fisher, 'seeking' goes with 'pleasure' and the fish. I take the primary meaning to be: 'They are enviably happy who, in exchanging mere placid existence ('peace') for active

#### 44 MATTHEWS: SHELLEY AND JANE WILLIAMS

sensuous enjoyment ('Life'), can remain blind to the price they must pay for it (the spear)'.<sup>1</sup>

Garnett had the good idea of dating the 'Lines' from the astronomical clues given in the poem; but these were not very convincingly interpreted. He wrote:

The exact date of composition may, perhaps, be inferred from the description of the moon, as—

'Balanced on her wings of light,  
Hovering in the purple night,'

which seems to imply that she was then near the full, with little or no declination. These circumstances concurred on the 1st and 2nd of May, 1822, but at no other period during Shelley's residence at Lerici.<sup>2</sup>

These suggested dates have not been challenged, but they are impossible. The weather alone rules them out, as Garnett himself doubtless realized when he came to edit Williams's journal forty years later. There are other objections. A full moon might do, at a pinch, for comparison with an aziola, but it will hardly suit an albatross, a bird famous for the narrowness and immense length of its wings. To justify this simile, the occasion recorded in the poem must have been within five days of a new moon, and since the moon was visible after sunset, within five days *after* a new moon.<sup>3</sup> Conditions of visibility will thus limit the possible dates to 23–26 April, 22–25 May, and 21–24 June. April can be quickly disposed of. The weather, as reported by Williams, was again unsuitable; Williams and Jane were away house-hunting from 23–25 April, and on their return they found the Shelleys oppressed by the news of Allegra's death; the party then broke up immediately for the journey to Spezia. There would be no chance of a trip to the coast under such conditions. Also 22–25 May seems unlikely because of the weather, though 22 is a possibility. But if the setting of the poem can be trusted in every detail—and there are reasons for believing it can—various requirements must be met. The time is well after sunset, since it is a 'silent time' and a 'purple night', the flowers are sleeping, and lights are visible round the bay and from the fisherman's lamp. The day has been warm (49–50), and the sea is dead calm (40). This suggests a period of fine, settled weather. The description of the moon in lines 7–14 cannot imply, as Garnett thought, that it is just at the meridian with little or no declination, because the 'purple night' in which it now hovers is deliberately contrasted with the 'azure dome' up which it climbed. That

<sup>1</sup> *Macmillan's Magazine*, June 1862, p. 122.

<sup>2</sup> I am much indebted for data and advice on the astronomical problems raised by this poem to Mr. H. W. P. Richards of the Royal Greenwich Observatory, who is not, however, responsible for the possibly unjustifiable conclusions drawn from them.



is, the moon must have done its climbing up the day sky, and now, after sunset, is not at meridian but balanced just above the sea before setting into it—hence the continued pertinence of the sea-bird simile. And although the moon's 'wings of light' are narrow, like those of an albatross, they are already broad enough to shed some moonlight: the ocean is 'bright & wide', and among the cancellations there lies 'a thread of moonlight' (46-47).

All these conditions are best met on the night of 22 or 23 June. 'The heats set in in the middle of June; the days became excessively hot', Mary wrote in her notes to the poems of 1822; for 22 June Williams recorded in his journal: 'Calm. Heat overpowering. . .'.<sup>1</sup> There was a new moon on the morning of 19 June; on 22 and 23 the moon reached its meridian in the late afternoon and set from two to three hours after the sun had set at 7.46 p.m., that is, within a few minutes of 10.08 p.m. and 10.31 p.m. respectively. On 23 June, at least, it would be bright enough to give some moonlight but still narrow enough to be compared to a hovering albatross. The domestic situation, too, would fit in well with this dating. Shelley must have been a good deal in Jane's company at this time, as Mary was ill (she had suffered a miscarriage on 16 June), and Williams was much occupied between 15 and 28 June in helping Captain Roberts to refit the *Don Juan* at Lerici. The chances are, then, that if the poem faithfully records the details of an actual evening, it was the evening of 22 or 23 June 1822. Such fidelity to environmental fact naturally cannot often be taken for granted in a love-poem. But important factors make it probable here: first, Shelley's now well-recognized respect for scientific accuracy; second, the presence of the *Don Juan*, which (since 12 May) caused its crew to keep a particularly observant eye on the weather and the heavens (Williams speculated in his journal on the effects of the new moon of 19 June);<sup>1</sup> and third, the circumstances of Shelley's love-affair with Jane Williams, which, having necessarily no future, led the poet to set a supreme value on the immediacy of its day-to-day contexts ('. . . if the past and future could be obliterated, the present would content me so well that I could say with Faust to the passing moment "Remain thou, thou art so beautiful"').<sup>2</sup> If these reasons for factual reliance on the poem have any weight, one of the two suggested dates would seem the most acceptable.

It has generally been assumed that whatever disclosures Jane Williams made after Shelley's death—and Mary Shelley told her, somewhat incoherently, on 14 February 1828 that 'to purchase oblivion of what was revealed to me last July a tortuous death would be a bed of roses'—Jane's relations with Shelley remained as ideal and innocent as his relations with earlier idols. The 'Lines written in the Bay of Lerici' do not discredit this

<sup>1</sup> Jones, p. 155.

<sup>2</sup> Letter to John Gisborne, 18 June 1822.

assumption, though they do prove, with their cancellations, that Shelley's desire for her at this time was not exactly that of the moth for the star. But the belief in a platonic relationship has hitherto based itself on the tentative earlier part of their friendship, at Pisa, whereas the evidence strongly indicates a relationship that developed late and very rapidly at San Terenzo towards a crisis. How else is it possible to explain Shelley's request for prussic acid made of Trelawny on 18 June, 'from the desire of avoiding needless suffering', at a time when his health was never better and when he was also saying 'my only regret is that the summer must ever pass'?<sup>1</sup> Or the extraordinary and mounting tension within the isolated household of Casa Magni as the May and June days went by—a tension that developed to the point of hallucinations in Shelley and Jane, and to near-hysteria in Mary? Biographers are so spellbound by the supernatural appearances of Shelley's last weeks on earth that they do not usually look very hard for the realities underlying them. Allegra's death and Mary's illness are plainly not enough to account for this crescendo of nervous excitement. But the rapid development of a love-affair, passionate on Shelley's part and at least complaisant on Jane's, cutting across the pattern of marriages within the confined little community of Casa Magni (and we should perhaps remember that Jane was not legally married to Edward Williams), would account perfectly well for the growing strain. Up to now there has been no direct evidence of such a relationship, though W. E. Peck claimed to have found some (and may well have done so).<sup>2</sup> There are, however, certain remarkable interlineations in Shelley's hand on the draft of *The Triumph of Life*, amounting to a private gloss on the poem, which seem to put the matter beyond doubt. A laconic one occurs amid a cancelled version of lines 524–5:<sup>3</sup>

- |                    |  |     |
|--------------------|--|-----|
| f. 51 <sup>v</sup> | From every firmest limb & fairest face<br>The strength & freshness fell like dust, & left<br>The actions and the shape without the grace                       | 520 |
| f. 52 <sup>r</sup> | Of life, the marble brow of youth was cleft<br>With <i>thought, desire burned as here</i><br>care, and in the eyes <i>which</i> once hope lit<br>Desire glared | 524 |

Adjoining line 524 is the single word, 'Jane'. If this were all, it would suggest no more than the cancellations of the 'Lines written in the Bay of Lerici'. But there is interlineation before and after this, in extremely

<sup>1</sup> Letter to Horace Smith, 29 June 1822.

<sup>2</sup> Shelley. *His Life and Work* (London, 1927), ii. 199.

<sup>3</sup> Bod. MS. Shelley adds. c. 4. I quote only the cancellations that seem to have most relevance.

significant places of the text.<sup>1</sup> The earlier case occurs at the end of the description (138-64) of the maidens and youths, 'tortured with their agonizing pleasure', who lead the Car of Life as bacchantes of sexual love, and who

f. 26<sup>v</sup>                      Like moths by light attracted & repelled,                      153  
                                     Oft to their bright destruction come & go,

until finally they fall, coupled together, in the path of the Car, and (Shelley goes on),

f. 26<sup>v</sup>                      ere I can say *where* the chariot hath                      161  
                                     Past over them; nor other trace I find  
                                     But as of foam after the Oceans wrath

Is spent upon the desert shore.—

Ink gives place to pencil between the words 'Oceans wrath', and a few corrections have been made in pencil in this and other recent passages. Also in pencil, written into the space between the tercets shown immediately above, are what appear to be the words: 'Jane & I'. The bottom half of this page contains an ink sketch of a sailing-boat and a rowing-dinghy, with the Italian word *Ricetti* ('refuges') written four times in large letters below them.<sup>2</sup>

The last example, and the clearest, is on the final leaf of the *Triumph*, where Rousseau is made to say:

f. 52<sup>v</sup>                      And some grew weary of the ghastly dance                      540  
                                     And fell, as I have fallen by the way side

Just below this last line, and partly enclosed by it, Shelley has written in ink in a minute hand:

Alas I kiss you Jane

The phrasing, and the sombre intensity of the context, leave little doubt that these words are a wry but unrepenting acknowledgement of his own fall from earlier principles of conduct—a recognition that, as the 'Lines written in the Bay of Lerici' had expressed it, Life was what he had sought with Jane Williams, not peace.

When were these additions made to the *Triumph of Life* manuscript? The gloss must mean either that Shelley, for his own bitter satisfaction,

<sup>1</sup> If Mary saw these interlineations, as her careful study of the draft for the 1824 *Posthumous Poems* makes likely, why was she so staggered by Jane's revelations four years later? That no one else has noticed them is not surprising, as it is easy to prove that no editor (including Mary) has ever read through the *Triumph of Life* draft since 1824.

<sup>2</sup> Five unpublished lines of verse, written with the paper upside down, do not seem to have any connexion either with *The Triumph of Life* or with Jane Williams.

was translating the universalized despair of the poem back into the private experience that had helped to generate it, more or less as he went along, or else that in reading over his draft he was struck by its retrospective aptness as a commentary on that experience. In either case, the love-affair with Jane Williams must have a crucial bearing on the interpretation of the poem, whether as illustration or as cause: Shelley has practically told us so himself; and the relationship will have to be accepted in the end for what it certainly was, the most profoundly disturbing personal experience of Shelley's whole maturity. That the first interlineation is in pencil seems to indicate that Shelley added it at the very moment of resuming work on the poem from line 164. These lines (164-75) are the only passage of *The Triumph of Life* drafted in pencil, and this use of pencil was plainly the occasion for all the pencil corrections in the preceding 32 lines, which in turn are the only pencil corrections made in the entire draft.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, the second and third glosses are both within 25 lines of the end of the draft, and must by any hypothesis have been added very late in Shelley's life. The dating of *The Triumph of Life* is a problem in itself; but at least the final 70 lines of the poem were drafted after 19 June, because the writing is interrupted at line 478 by a fragment of a letter to Captain Roberts almost certainly started and scrapped on that day.<sup>2</sup> The most reasonable conclusion seems to be that the poem and the love-affair to a large extent developed concurrently, so that the distinction between a running and a retrospective commentary is perhaps not as meaningful as it sounds. Shelley left Jane Williams for the last time on 1 July, and was drowned a week later. Whenever it was that he surrendered himself to the delusive flame, the fisher was even closer with his spear than the victim had predicted.

<sup>1</sup> Pencil corrections occur in the following 9 lines only of *The Triumph of Life*: 132, 145, 150, 154, 155, 158, 161, 162, 163. There is one correction in ink on the pencil draft (167).

<sup>2</sup> Bodl. MS. Shelley adds. c. 4, f. 48<sup>v</sup> rev. It begins:

Dear Roberts

I have just received a letter from Hunt which makes me anxious to see him before he leaves Genoa—

It was therefore written immediately after receiving Hunt's first letter from Genoa, dated 15 June, which only arrived on 19 June owing to its misdirection to Pisa, and before the change of mind recorded in Shelley's reply to Hunt, also dated 19 June. On f. 45<sup>v</sup>, 41 lines further back in the poem, are sketches apparently meant for the billet-head or false stem that Williams began fitting to the *Don Juan* on 17 June.

## NOTES

### THE CARTOGRAPHY OF 'THE DEFINITION OF LOVE'

ALTHOUGH the imagery of Marvell's 'Definition of Love' has been widely admired,<sup>1</sup> Mr. Dennis Davison's celestial identification is the first attempt to show a coherent development of the imagery in the final stanzas.<sup>2</sup> The abstractness of the celestial identification is not altogether satisfying, however, especially in the climactic stanza VII. Nor do the sources, which have been thoroughly studied, resolve the problem since they show that Marvell's terminology is applicable to both terrestrial and celestial interpretations.

The two degrees of love forming the subject of the poem receive their most striking identity in stanza VII. A hitherto unnoticed possibility for the reading of these lines offers a reason for identifying the imagery of stanzas V, VI, and VII as terrestrial rather than celestial. A map made from a planispheric representation of the earth with 'parallel' lines of latitude and 'oblique' lines of longitude provides a simple but moving image to symbolize the natures of the pure love and the common love.

As Lines so Loves *oblique* may well  
Themselves in every Angle greet:  
But ours so truly *Parallel*  
Though infinite can never meet.<sup>3</sup>

Lines of latitude are not only parallel and therefore infinite, but they are also represented as circles, the perfect geometric form; like Marvell's ideal love they 'can never meet'. The meridians, or lines of longitude, are oblique and, like common loves, 'may well | Themselves in every Angle greet'. By using M. Legouis's paraphrase, 'two oblique lines (in the same plane) are sure to form an angle',<sup>4</sup> we can see that the 'Loves *oblique*' are pictured by the meridians, which form angles when they cross at the poles. We should note also that the idea of common loves would be embarrassed by a reading that links them with cosmic values.

With the terrestrial globe and its cartographic representations in mind

<sup>1</sup> Ruth Wallerstein cited "The Definition of Love" especially for its use of 'symbolic image' (*Studies in Seventeenth-Century Poetic* (Madison, 1950), pp. 167-8), and Rosemund Tuve has noted Marvell's mastery of images of similitude, that is, images that 'constitute conceptual meanings without further "general" statements . . .' (*Elizabethan and Metaphysical Imagery* (Chicago, 1947), p. 349). See also Douglas Bush, *English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century* (Oxford, 1945), pp. 162-3.

<sup>2</sup> 'Marvell's "Definition of Love"', *R.E.S.*, n.s. vi (1955), 141-6.

<sup>3</sup> *Poems and Letters*, ed. H. M. Margoliouth (Oxford, 1927), i. 37, ll. 25-28.

<sup>4</sup> Pierre Legouis, 'Marvell and Massinger: A Source of "The Definition of Love"' *R.E.S.*, xxiii (1947), 64.



as a primary image, Marvell's use of parallel and oblique lines can be seen as a logical development of the images in the two preceding stanzas.<sup>1</sup> The problem here is his use of the two poles and their relationship to the planisphere that allows them to touch:

And therefore her Decrees of Steel  
Us as the distant Poles have plac'd,  
(Though Loves whole World on us doth wheel)  
Not by themselves to be embrac'd. (16-20)

A reading that uses the celestial poles, first suggested by M. Legouis (*André Marvell*, p. 145) and developed by Mr. Davison, puts the reader in the position of trying to visualize the celestial poles. In either a Ptolemaic or a Copernican universe, they can only be imagined as projections of the earth's axis into a constantly changing space; there is no simple representation. But one has only to look at a common model of the terrestrial globe to be caught up by the immediacy of the image; the two ideal lovers can indeed be visualized as the 'distant Poles', inexorably separated while serving the archetypal function of having 'Loves whole World' wheel on them.

With this globe before his eyes, the reader moves easily into the following stanza, in which the globe is flattened to a planisphere:

Unless the giddy Heaven fall,  
And Earth some new Convulsion tear;  
And, us to joyn, the World should all  
Be cramp'd into a *Planisphere*. (21-24)

Mr. Davison also associates the 'lines' and 'angles' of the celestial identification with the 'planisphere', suggesting that it is best understood as a polar projection of a part of the celestial sphere, the most common meaning assigned to it by the *O.E.D.*, especially in one form of the astrolabe. But 'planisphere' is primarily a generic term referring to any kind of 'map or chart formed by the projection of a sphere, or part of one, on a plane' (*O.E.D.*). For instance, Ptolemy's lost 'Planisphaerium' refers to a projection of the terrestrial sphere on the equator, in which the eye, or point of perspective, is at the pole (*Enc. Brit.*, 11th edn.); such a planisphere, which is the kind of projection known to modern cartography as 'stereographic', would show either the northern or southern hemisphere as a full circle with the pole in the centre, the parallel lines of latitude forming circles, and the meridians all crossing at the poles.

Whether the 'World' be heaven and earth, or earth alone, any imagined

<sup>1</sup> These lines have previously been admired only for their use of abstract geometric imagery (Legouis, *André Marvell* (London and Paris, 1928), p. 146; Bush, p. 163; Brooks and Warren, *Understanding Poetry* (New York, 1938), p. 439).

cataclysm that flattened out the harmoniously ordered cosmos would force the earth, as the inner sphere, into a flat surface with its poles touching. The advantage of seeing the planisphere as referring to the earth is that such a cataclysm would theoretically force the globe into a double-faced surface, either surface of which would look like the map described in Ptolemy's 'Planisphaerium', a kind of map that the popular atlases had made familiar to Marvell's contemporaries. If the reader imagines a terrestrial planisphere, he has before his eyes the image that symbolizes the two loves through parallels and meridians in the next stanza.

Another argument for celestial imagery in stanzas v and vi is that Marvell seems to make a distinction between 'World' and 'Earth'; the 'World', comprising both 'Heaven' and 'Earth', is 'cramp'd into a *Planisphere*'. But the word 'World' does not demand such an interpretation, nor is the distinction suggested the only one possible. The change in terminology effectively and appropriately changes the emphasis from the earth to the earth plus 'all created things upon it'. Though 'world' was, of course, used to denote the universe, its most common use was terrestrial: 'the earth and all created things upon it; the terraqueous globe and its inhabitants' (*O.E.D.*, s.v., 7).

Although the celestial identification has the advantage of bringing the astrological reference in the final stanza into closer harmony with the preceding stanzas and indicating the relationship between the ideal love and the purity of the heavens, it lacks the clarity and concreteness of Marvell's usual method. With a terrestrial identification, the poem moves steadily through the simple and sensuous immediacy of commonly known references to the climactic symbolic image of stanza vii.

DEAN MORGAN SCHMITTER

*Professor Legouis writes:*

Mr. Schmitter considers me the originator of the celestial interpretation of Marvell's 'Poles', and I will not decline the honour and responsibility;<sup>1</sup> yet I beg leave to point out that instinctive caution, even in 1928, made me insert an adverb of uncertainty in my statement: 'Marvell compare sa maîtresse et lui-même aux pôles, probablement aux pôles célestes.' Now I should double this caution. And indeed I own that Mr. Schmitter has made quite a respectable case for the terrestrial interpretation. If he has failed to prove his point it is because most arguments in the case cut both ways, as he himself partly admits.

But first I welcome unreservedly his suggestion that the 'oblique lines'

<sup>1</sup> *Pace* Mr. Dennis Davison, who in 1955 (*R.E.S.*, N.S. vi. 143-4) proclaimed it his discovery. It seems, by his own apology (p. 145), that he was not within reach of a good library at the time.

of stanza VII are meridians represented as straight lines, intersecting at either pole, in equatorial projections of the northern and southern hemispheres. And I wish I had made the suggestion myself, since it provides an ingenious and yet simple antithesis of meridians and parallels. Besides, this certainly connects stanza VII better with the preceding one, ending on 'planisphere'.<sup>1</sup> Of course the two comparisons (of the poles in stanzas V-VI and of the parallels and oblique lines in stanza VII) remain distinct, but the former leads up to the latter, which is also cartographic. As regards, however, the terrestrial or celestial interpretations we are left just where we stood before: meridians no less than parallels belong to the sky as well as to the earth.

And the same remark holds good for the 'planisphere' of stanza VI.<sup>2</sup> Mr. Schmitter candidly admits that 'the most common meaning assigned to it by the *O.E.D.*' is the celestial one. He also grants that 'whether the "World" be heaven and earth, or earth alone, any imagined cataclysm that flattened out the harmoniously ordered cosmos would force the earth, as the inner sphere, into a flat surface with its poles touching'. (By the way, this implies, as I said in 1928, that Marvell had retained the Ptolemaic system, for poetic purposes at least, though Mr. Schmitter leaves it in doubt.) So that the main, or rather the only reason to prefer the terrestrial 'planisphere' would be the easier visualizing by the reader of the crushed earth, thanks to his memory of 'the popular atlases'. But were representations, in atlases or individual maps, of a flat universe any less 'popular' than those of a flat earth? I doubt it; down to the nineteenth century people were far more interested in the celestial poles than in the terrestrial ones, from utilitarian motives: not to mention astrology, navigation had a use for maps of the northern and southern hemispheres of the sky rather than of the earth.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It seems at any rate superior to Mr. Davison's far-fetched and rather confused interpretations of 'line' and 'oblique' (pp. 144-5): he may have been thinking of the meridians but only as 'curvilinear', and I do not see that he names them.

<sup>2</sup> Parodying lines of Cleveland's that Marvell certainly read and remembered, we might say: '... what on earth we find—The sky can parallel for name and kind.'

<sup>3</sup> I am a complete layman in cartography but I have looked up old maps and histories of mapmaking, first in the University and Town Libraries of Lyons and then at the Bibliothèque Nationale and the Paris Observatory. In most terrestrial atlases I have seen, published in the sixteenth century or the earlier half of the seventeenth, there is no map of either hemisphere in equatorial projection but only a map of Arctic regions extending to the northernmost points now of Iceland now of Scotland, and at most including Great Britain; such maps, of course, would not fit Marvell's planisphere since their circumference could not coincide with that of the corresponding Antarctic maps (absent from these atlases). Besides, most of those maps (e.g. Mercator's) represent the North Pole as the meeting-point, at such right angles as wavy lines permit, of four wide rivers, or rather arms of the sea, cutting a frozen continent into four sectors. In 1641 Hondius and Jansson's *Nouveau Théâtre du Monde ou Nouvel Atlas*, vol. i, map B, proved the advance of the scientific spirit by leaving all beyond Spitzbergen a blank. On the other hand,

In his conclusion Mr. Schmitter appeals to the 'concreteness of Marvell's usual method', praising 'the simple and sensuous immediacy of commonly known references' in his similes. This statement calls for serious qualification. Marvell less here than anywhere else takes his cue from Milton; rather is he one of 'our late Fantasticks'. And his originality, especially when he describes, lies in the transformation of concrete into abstract, not the other way round. So that I remain obdurate: the power of 'The Definition of Love' lies in its scientific bareness and abstraction, in its unsensuousness.<sup>1</sup>

Negative criticism, though often necessary nowadays, suffers under a discredit. Therefore I shall try to be constructive, or at least to provide the future constructor with three or four pieces of building material.

(i) Donne, 'The Crosse', ll. 23-24:

All the Globes frame, and spheares, is nothing else  
But the Meridians crossing Parallels.

Donne does not choose between the terrestrial ('Globes') and celestial ('spheares') meridians and parallels—and why should *we* at all costs?

(ii) Donne, 'Sermon LVI' (quoted in Logan Pearsall Smith's *Selected Passages*, p. 217):

If you look upon this world in a Map, you find two Hemispheres, two half worlds. If you crush heaven into a Map, you may find two Hemispheres too, two half heavens; . . .

I have seen several couples of maps of the northern and southern celestial hemispheres. The only thing that troubles me is that, on the two nearest in point of time to Marvell's poem (Bibliothèque Nationale, GD 12,642, i and ii, on sale 'Chez Melchior Tauernier', c. 1628; GD 12,643, i and ii, on sale 'Chez Anthoine de Fer', 1650), while the meridians are all right, the parallels are not shown; there are indeed circles but their centres are wide of the pole, and the circumference of the smallest circle passes by the pole. They tell me its centre is the pole of the ecliptic. But for this anomaly I should not hesitate to assert that Marvell had celestial maps before his mind's eye if he had anything concrete at all.

A rather belated correspondence with the Map Room of the British Museum has brought additional support for the view that the poles are celestial rather than terrestrial. So thinks Miss Helen Wallis, Assistant Keeper, whom I thank for providing interesting information, and Mr. R. A. Skelton approves her answer. However, Miss Wallis suggests that the oblique lines of stanza vii might be 'the loxodromic compass lines on the mariners' charts or globes of the day' and refers to Blundeville's *Exercises* (7th edn., 1636), pp. 691 and 695. The suggestion is attractive, but since these charts are on the Mercator projection the connexion with stanzas v and vi would disappear. So that on this point I still feel inclined to side with Mr. Schmitter.

<sup>1</sup> To quote my conclusion of 1928: 'Ainsi l'analyse révèle trois termes différents de comparaison avec l'amour malheureux du poète, mais la pièce n'en conserve pas moins son atmosphère abstraite, scientifique, dépouillée de toute sensualité dans l'expression d'une ardeur passionnée.' It may be useful to recall that French has only one word, unfortunately, for 'sensuality' and 'sensuousness'.

of stanza VII are meridians represented as straight lines, intersecting at either pole, in equatorial projections of the northern and southern hemispheres. And I wish I had made the suggestion myself, since it provides an ingenious and yet simple antithesis of meridians and parallels. Besides, this certainly connects stanza VII better with the preceding one, ending on 'planisphere'.<sup>1</sup> Of course the two comparisons (of the poles in stanzas V-VI and of the parallels and oblique lines in stanza VII) remain distinct, but the former leads up to the latter, which is also cartographic. As regards, however, the terrestrial or celestial interpretations we are left just where we stood before: meridians no less than parallels belong to the sky as well as to the earth.

And the same remark holds good for the 'planisphere' of stanza VI.<sup>2</sup> Mr. Schmitter candidly admits that 'the most common meaning assigned to it by the *O.E.D.*' is the celestial one. He also grants that 'whether the "World" be heaven and earth, or earth alone, any imagined cataclysm that flattened out the harmoniously ordered cosmos would force the earth, as the inner sphere, into a flat surface with its poles touching'. (By the way, this implies, as I said in 1928, that Marvell had retained the Ptolemaic system, for poetic purposes at least, though Mr. Schmitter leaves it in doubt.) So that the main, or rather the only reason to prefer the terrestrial 'planisphere' would be the easier visualizing by the reader of the crushed earth, thanks to his memory of 'the popular atlases'. But were representations, in atlases or individual maps, of a flat universe any less 'popular' than those of a flat earth? I doubt it; down to the nineteenth century people were far more interested in the celestial poles than in the terrestrial ones, from utilitarian motives: not to mention astrology, navigation had a use for maps of the northern and southern hemispheres of the sky rather than of the earth.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It seems at any rate superior to Mr. Davison's far-fetched and rather confused interpretations of 'line' and 'oblique' (pp. 144-5): he may have been thinking of the meridians but only as 'curvilinear', and I do not see that he names them.

<sup>2</sup> Parodying lines of Cleveland's that Marvell certainly read and remembered, we might say: '... what on earth we find—The sky can parallel for name and kind.'

<sup>3</sup> I am a complete layman in cartography but I have looked up old maps and histories of mapmaking, first in the University and Town Libraries of Lyons and then at the Bibliothèque Nationale and the Paris Observatory. In most terrestrial atlases I have seen, published in the sixteenth century or the earlier half of the seventeenth, there is no map of either hemisphere in equatorial projection but only a map of Arctic regions extending to the northernmost points now of Iceland now of Scotland, and at most including Great Britain; such maps, of course, would not fit Marvell's planisphere since their circumference could not coincide with that of the corresponding Antarctic maps (absent from these atlases). Besides, most of those maps (e.g. Mercator's) represent the North Pole as the meeting-point, at such right angles as wavy lines permit, of four wide rivers, or rather arms of the sea, cutting a frozen continent into four sectors. In 1641 Hondius and Jansson's *Nouveau Théâtre du Monde ou Nouvel Atlas*, vol. i, map B, proved the advance of the scientific spirit by leaving all beyond Spitzbergen a blank. On the other hand,



In his conclusion Mr. Schmitter appeals to the 'concreteness of Marvell's usual method', praising 'the simple and sensuous immediacy of commonly known references' in his similes. This statement calls for serious qualification. Marvell less here than anywhere else takes his cue from Milton; rather is he one of 'our late Fantasticks'. And his originality, especially when he describes, lies in the transformation of concrete into abstract, not the other way round. So that I remain obdurate: the power of 'The Definition of Love' lies in its scientific bareness and abstraction, in its unsensuousness.<sup>1</sup>

Negative criticism, though often necessary nowadays, suffers under a discredit. Therefore I shall try to be constructive, or at least to provide the future constructor with three or four pieces of building material.

(i) Donne, 'The Crosse', ll. 23-24:

All the Globes frame, and spheares, is nothing else  
But the Meridians crossing Parallels.

Donne does not choose between the terrestrial ('Globes') and celestial ('spheares') meridians and parallels—and why should we at all costs?

(ii) Donne, 'Sermon LVI' (quoted in Logan Pearsall Smith's *Selected Passages*, p. 217):

If you look upon this world in a Map, you find two Hemispheres, two half worlds. If you crush heaven into a Map, you may find two Hemispheres too, two half heavens; . . .

I have seen several couples of maps of the northern and southern celestial hemispheres. The only thing that troubles me is that, on the two nearest in point of time to Marvell's poem (Bibliothèque Nationale, GD 12,642, i and ii, on sale 'Chez Melchior Tauernier', c. 1628; GD 12,643, i and ii, on sale 'Chez Anthoine de Fer', 1650), while the meridians are all right, the parallels are not shown; there are indeed circles but their centres are wide of the pole, and the circumference of the smallest circle passes by the pole. They tell me its centre is the pole of the ecliptic. But for this anomaly I should not hesitate to assert that Marvell had celestial maps before his mind's eye if he had anything concrete at all.

A rather belated correspondence with the Map Room of the British Museum has brought additional support for the view that the poles are celestial rather than terrestrial. So thinks Miss Helen Wallis, Assistant Keeper, whom I thank for providing interesting information, and Mr. R. A. Skelton approves her answer. However, Miss Wallis suggests that the oblique lines of stanza VII might be 'the loxodromic compass lines on the mariners' charts or globes of the day' and refers to Blundeville's *Exercises* (7th edn., 1636), pp. 691 and 695. The suggestion is attractive, but since these charts are on the Mercator projection the connexion with stanzas v and vi would disappear. So that on this point I still feel inclined to side with Mr. Schmitter.

<sup>1</sup> To quote my conclusion of 1928: 'Ainsi l'analyse révèle trois termes différents de comparaison avec l'amour malheureux du poète, mais la pièce n'en conserve pas moins son atmosphère abstraite, scientifique, dépouillée de toute sensualité dans l'expression d'une ardeur passionnée.' It may be useful to recall that French has only one word, unfortunately, for 'sensuality' and 'sensuousness'.

Here indeed the two terrestrial hemispheres are the eastern and western ones, and the celestial hemispheres are Joy (now) and Glory (later). But the significant word is 'crush', which possibly gave Marvell the hint for his 'cramp'd'. All critics—including Mr. Schmitter?—agree that Donne's influence reveals itself at its strongest in 'The Definition of Love', and Donne could be pretty abstract when he chose.

(iii) George Chapman, *Bussy d'Ambois*, the last two lines of all (Montsurry *loquitur*, to his unfaithful wife):

And may both points of heavens strait axeltree  
Conjoyne in one, before thy selfe and me.

Here we have the disillusioned connubial use of the analogy, again with the celestial poles—but no less could be expected from such an hyperbolist as Chapman.

(iv) Sir Thomas Browne, *Religio Medici*, part I, section 4:

... a reconciliation [between Christians] which though peaceable Spirits doe desire, and may conceive that revolution of time, and the mercies of God may effect, yet that judgement that shall consider the present antipathies between the two extreames, their contrarieties in condition, affection and opinion, may with the same hopes expect an union in the poles of Heaven.

Browne has chosen the celestial poles.

To conclude: in my 1928 analysis of the poem (pp. 145–6) I should want to alter only the following sentence:

De cette comparaison [in stanza vi] cosmographique et cartographique nous passons sans transition à une image géométrique, celle des lignes parallèles et des loyales amours qui ne se rencontrent jamais, tandis que 'les lignes et les amours obliques se saluent' dans des angles; et, à la strophe suivante . . .

Read instead:

De cette comparaison cosmographique et cartographique nous passons à une image qui en apparence relève de la simple géométrie, celle des lignes parallèles et des loyales amours qui ne se rencontrent jamais, tandis que 'les lignes et les amours obliques se saluent' dans des angles; mais ces parallèles sont aussi cartographiques et les 'lignes obliques' auxquelles pense Marvell ont toute chance d'être les méridiens dont le pôle est le point d'intersection dans chaque hémisphère (nord et sud): la méthode de la projection équatoriale fait de ces méridiens des lignes droites. A la strophe suivante . . .

PIERRE LEGOUIS

WORDSWORTH'S VAUDRACOUR AND WILKINSON'S  
THE WANDERER

FOR the story of Vaudracour and Julia in *The Prelude* (Book IX) Wordsworth possibly drew upon Helen M. Williams's account of a Norman friend, A. A. Thomas du Fossé, in her *Letters Written in France* (1790).<sup>1</sup> Her narrative contains no parallel, however, to the *dénouement* of Wordsworth's Vaudracour's—ultimate loss of sanity.<sup>2</sup> This motif Wordsworth may have derived from the same source as that of an anecdote abridged in Joshua Lucock Wilkinson's *The Wanderer* (1795).

A travel-diary sprinkled with political reflections, *The Wanderer* describes Wilkinson's visits to the Continent in the summers of 1791 and 1793. After one of his sharp comments on the old order in France he remarks:

I flattered myself with the hope of being permitted to insert a woeful tale of the loves of a chevalier near Blois, and a young bourgeoisie, his consequent imprisonment and insanity, the barbarous rigour of his noble father, the blessed effect of *Lettres de cachet*, and the mild controul of the ancient government; but as the gentleman, who is possessed of the facts, intends to throw the substance into the stile of a novel, the public will receive it in a much more finished form, than if curtailed and despoiled of its numerous circumstances, to suit the varied and detached mood of the Wanderer.<sup>3</sup>

When and from whom Wilkinson got this story he nowhere reveals. Since he tells it in that part of his book which deals mainly with his second tour, he may not have heard it until 1793 or later. The informant to whose prior interest he bows was probably an Englishman who had been, as he had not, at Blois. Such a person, in 1793, was Wordsworth.

That Wilkinson knew Wordsworth, and knew him before that year, is almost certain. Born sometime between 1768 and 1771, he was of nearly the same age, and part of his boyhood was spent, like Wordsworth's, at Cockermouth.<sup>4</sup> His maternal grandfather, Joshua Lucock, of Cockermouth and Lorton Hall, built at Cockermouth the house in which Wordsworth was born and which remained his home until 1783.<sup>5</sup> At either Cocker-

<sup>1</sup> F. M. Todd, *Politics and the Poet* (London, 1957), p. 217.

<sup>2</sup> 'Wordsworth's Vaudracour', *T.L.S.*, 21 Feb. 1958, p. 101.

<sup>3</sup> *The Wanderer*, 2nd edn. (London, 1798), ii. 205-6. Subsequent references are to this edition. In 1793 Wilkinson brought out a version of his second tour under the title *Political Facts*.

<sup>4</sup> His parents were married on 24 Sept. 1767, according to information furnished by Mr. C. Roy Hudleston; and from his mother's will (P.C.C., Kenyon 71, at Somerset House) it is clear that on 22 Oct. 1792 he was the eldest child and of legal age.

<sup>5</sup> An inscription on the lintel of the rear door reads: 'Joshua Lucock built y<sup>e</sup> house 1745.'

mouth or Lorton Hall Wilkinson's mother seems to have lived with him and her other children while his father, Captain George Wilkinson, R.N., was absent from England, for he notes in *The Wanderer*:

Previous to my first pedestrian excursion on the continent, I had frequently seen the mountains and lakes of the north of England; and though, in my school-boy fancy, I had exaggerated the terrors of the mighty Alps, the reason of a more mature age pruned the luxuriance of imagination. . . . The lakes . . . of Cumberland are meagre copies of the grand originals of Switzerland. (ii. 131)

If Wilkinson was a schoolboy at Cockermouth, he and Wordsworth would have been associates until Wordsworth left for Hawkshead in the spring of 1779—longer if he too attended Hawkshead.<sup>1</sup>

Even if Wilkinson did not meet Wordsworth at Cockermouth, he may have come to know Wordsworth's brother Richard there. After his father's death in 1782, his mother appears to have made Cockermouth her permanent residence,<sup>2</sup> and supposedly he stayed with her until he went to London in 1790 or 1791. During this interval he might well have encountered Richard, who on leaving Hawkshead in 1785 became a solicitor's clerk at Branthwaite, near Cockermouth.<sup>3</sup>

Whether or not Wilkinson and Richard were acquainted in Cumberland, their paths definitely crossed in London in 1794 and probably earlier. In January 1791 Richard entered a solicitor's office at Gray's Inn as a clerk. About the same time Wilkinson took a similar position, apparently at Gray's Inn, for in the following June, when he was at Geneva, he declared his vocation as 'un de la loi', and he was living at Gray's Inn when he was admitted to it as a student on 2 May 1793.<sup>4</sup> By this date, approximately, Richard had left Gray's Inn and had set up his own law office at Staple Inn.<sup>5</sup> A year and a half later, needing a witness to his signature on a very important bond, instead of asking someone at Staple Inn to oblige him, he went to the other side of Holborn; and on 21 October 1794 'Jos<sup>a</sup>. Lu: Wilkinson' of 'Grays Inn' wrote his name under Richard's on the document.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Hawkshead would have been a likely school for him to enter because of its location, but, according to Mr. T. W. Thompson, his name does not occur in its library records, and as no registers have survived, there is no proof that he was enrolled.

<sup>2</sup> Captain Wilkinson was lost at sea (*Gent. Mag.*, 1782, p. 499, and 1783, p. 267). His widow was living at Cockermouth when she signed her will in 1792 and at Lorton Hall when she died in 1801 (*ibid.*, 1801, p. 1154).

<sup>3</sup> Mary Moorman, *William Wordsworth* (Oxford, 1957), p. 76; Solicitors' Articles at the Public Record Office.

<sup>4</sup> *The Wanderer*, i. 31; Joseph Foster, *The Register of Admissions to Gray's Inn* (London, 1889), ii. 398.

<sup>5</sup> A letter dated 16 May 1793 is addressed to him at Staple Inn (Dove Cottage Papers, Family Letters and Papers, box 10).

<sup>6</sup> Dove Cottage Papers, file XXV, box 10, folder C.

Richard's action indicates that he already knew Wilkinson well: he would hardly have invited a stranger to attest his autograph. Accordingly, it is reasonable to infer that Wilkinson was the Wilkinson who shared lodgings with him in 1792. Early in September of that year Wordsworth wrote to Richard from Blois:

I look forward to the time of seeing you Wilkinson and my other friends with pleasure. I am very happy you have got into Chambers, as I shall perhaps be obliged to stay a few weeks in town about my publication—you will with Wilkinson's permission find me a place for a bed—Give Wilkinson my best compliments—I have apologies to make for not having written to him.<sup>1</sup>

These remarks prove that Wordsworth had met Richard's fellow-lodger before he left for France late in November 1791. They also strengthen the conclusion that the fellow-lodger was Joshua Lucock Wilkinson. In November 1791 the future author of *The Wanderer* had just come back from his first visit to the Continent. As his itinerary had been at many points identical with the one which Wordsworth had followed in the summer of 1790, the two men would no doubt have had a mutual interest in comparing notes. This interest would renew itself when Wordsworth returned from France late in 1792 and, presumably at Richard's and Wilkinson's lodgings, polished the manuscript of *Descriptive Sketches*,<sup>2</sup> for Wilkinson had visited some of the scenes which the poem portrays. Quite possibly he saw the manuscript and made suggestions. He was familiar, at all events, with the published text and was so much struck with Wordsworth's phrase for Como, 'bosom'd deep in chestnut groves', that he quoted it, though without mentioning either Wordsworth or the poem, when he described Como in *The Wanderer*.<sup>3</sup>

If Wilkinson was a friend of Wordsworth—and the evidence points that way—it was Wordsworth, in all likelihood, who told him about 'a chevalier near Blois, and a young bourgeoisie'. But if this is what happened, it follows that Wordsworth originally planned to make Vaudracour and Julia the hero and the heroine of a novel.

CHESTER L. SHAVER

<sup>1</sup> E. de Selincourt, *The Early Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth* (Oxford, 1935), p. 77.

<sup>2</sup> Published on 29 Jan. 1793, according to the *Morning Chronicle* for that day, p. 2.

<sup>3</sup> i. 148. When he adds that 'the vines incircle the elms, or running up the houses, colour the white-walled towns with roofs of green, and purple', he perhaps echoes Wordsworth's 'purple roof of vines'.



## REVIEWS

**Old English Prudentius Glosses at Boulogne-sur-mer.** Edited by HERBERT DEAN MERITT. Pp. xiv+158 (Stanford Studies in Language and Literature 16). Stanford: University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1959. 24s. net.

MS. Boulogne-sur-mer 189 (originally of S. Bertin) contains the poems of Prudentius, heavily glossed in Latin in the early eleventh century. Soon after this, many Old English glosses were entered in some sections of the manuscript. Holder's careful edition of these English glosses, in *Germania*, xxiii (1878), is inconvenient to use and scarcely accessible. Professor Meritt has extended his work of recording and interpreting Old English glosses by issuing this large group with consecutive numeration, Latin and English indexes, and reproductions of five folios to illustrate the layout of the Latin and English glosses. The method of glossing is clarified by quotation of the lemmata in their context on the lower half of each page. Mr. Meritt has made some additions and corrections to Holder's edition. In a short introduction he dismisses some twenty ghost-words that have found their way into dictionaries and draws attention to particular features, such as the general accuracy of the renderings, and the high proportion of adjectives formed in *-ul/-al*, ten of which are recorded only here.

The interpretative notes at the foot of each page are clear and helpful, and are designed to represent this important document as faithfully as possible. There is no room to discuss the value of the evidence that the Boulogne glosses offer about the materials and methods of pre-Conquest scholars who compiled and used Latin-English word-lists. For this, the reader will need to consult the author's previous publication in the same series, *Fact and Lore about Old English Words* (1954), to which he is sometimes referred for detailed discussion of word-forms and meanings. Although the purpose of this small work is mainly lexicographical, it has fruitful suggestions about the methods of glossing and the contents of alphabetical glossaries. Mr. Meritt has been able to follow up the work of Lindsay and Napier on the sources of the early glossaries Épinal-Erfurt and Corpus (viii-ix), and of Lübke on the glossaries of MSS. Cotton Cleopatra A III and Harley 3376 (x-early xi).

Lübke had recognized a large intake of Aldhelm glosses in the first Cleopatra glossary. Mr. Meritt has shown that the slightly later Harley collection incorporates groups drawn from interlinear glosses to the works of Aldhelm, Sedulius (*Carmen Paschale*), and Prudentius (*Psychomachia*); Harley provides the first evidence of glosses from Sedulius and Prudentius collected into Latin-English alphabetical lists. Although small groups of Aldhelm glosses have been detected in the Corpus glossary, it seems that systematic annotation in English to the works of these three Christian poets began in the latter half of the tenth century. There was intensive glossing of some Aldhelm manuscripts during the early eleventh century, largely by writers of one scriptorium, which may have been Abingdon (see Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts containing Anglo-Saxon*, p. 3). Within this same

period falls the largest collection of English glosses to Prudentius, that of the Boulogne MS. (1,077 items), entered by four different hands. By this time there was a large accumulation of Latin scholia to the works of Prudentius, the product of Carolingian teachers of the ninth century (see Schanz, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, iii. 232-5; Manitius, *Historische Vierteljahrsschrift*, xxviii (1933-4), 142 ff.). This system of interpretation was reproduced in Prudentius manuscripts of the succeeding centuries, with a growing accretion of vernacular glosses. The many Old High German glosses belong, like the English ones, mainly to the eleventh century. English glosses to Prudentius occur in eight other manuscripts besides Boulogne: all have been published, five by Napier, *Old English Glosses* (1900), three by Meritt, *Old English Glosses* (1945). Some have only very few sporadic English glosses; but four manuscripts have a sizeable nucleus, and no common source has been detected for any of the entries. MS. Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 223 provides the earliest evidence of the study of Prudentius in England. According to Ker's *Catalogue*, the text is continental (ix-x), imported probably from S. Bertin. Latin glosses were entered in an English hand of mid-tenth century, while the forty-four vernacular glosses were added in the early eleventh. It would seem that the English annotators of Prudentius worked from their local word-lists and individual resources, not within a common tradition. It might now be possible to study the whole group, in relation to the Latin scholia, and to the activities of other English glossators in the eleventh century. Mr. Meritt may discover more material. At all events, we may hope that he will continue to supplement and develop the fundamental work of Napier and Lindsay.

JOAN TURVILLE-PETRE

**The Advent Lyrics of the Exeter Book.** Edited by JACKSON J. CAMPBELL. Pp. xii+138. Princeton: University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1959. 30s. net.

An available edition of the first part of the Exeter Book trilogy known as *Crist* will be welcome to students of Anglo-Saxon. Welcome, also, especially to those who are concerned to teach Anglo-Saxon literature, will be the editor's intention to study the lyrics 'as poems rather than as documents'. The edition, however, has not neglected the traditional apparatus of notes, bibliography, and glossary. The introduction falls into three main sections dealing with the liturgical background, the structure and sources, date and dialect. The text as a whole is carefully printed, although it would have been helpful to have the line references to Cook's edition as well as to the individual lyrics.

The section on style is often perceptive though sometimes merely focusing insights of Cook or, at least, building on and selecting from his diffuse material. But it would, perhaps, have been more illuminating had it placed the lyrics in the context of Old English and medieval poetic practice. For example, it is true, as Cook pointed out, and as Mr. Campbell reminds us, that the Old English poems reveal a dominant ternary pattern of address, doctrine, and petition instead of the binary (address, petition) form of the Latin. The doctrinal section in the Old

English is usually a rendering of interpretative patristic material bearing on the Latin invocation. This procedure is certainly characteristic of the didactic nature of Old English poetry. But more significant is the emergence of a dominant narrative form. This is noted by Mr. Campbell himself (though not generally applied) in relation to poem v, of which he justly observes that the poet has turned 'these rather powerful emotional effects [of the Latin] into poetry of statement'. Striking in the lyrics is the use of the 'narrative figures' so evident in the Old English elegies. Thus in lyric II the dominant image seems to be that of the man in prison, and it is interesting that the poet virtually ignores the traditional interpretation of the key of David in favour of an interpretation (taken apparently from hymnology) which facilitates the use of this narrative figure. The use of a dominant image is seen again in lyric I with its reiterated building image which, like the elegiac imagery of *The Wanderer*, unifies and dominates the poem; and surely the ruined building at the end of this lyric must derive its poetic force from contextual association with the elegiac theme. In the second place, the editor does not always make explicit the fact that the unity of the lyrics is often thematic rather than logical just as medieval architectural schemes are thematic rather than naturalistic. Thus Mr. Campbell writes of lyric VI: 'what holds the whole together and leaves the reader with the feeling that there is real unity in this rather rambling structure is the attitude of the poet toward God, an attitude of fresh, optimistic enthusiasm from beginning to end.' But in fact the transition of ideas in this poem is quite natural. Melchisedek (as Mr. Campbell notes) is 'king of righteousness and king of peace' (Hebrews vii. 2) and, therefore, is properly associated with Christ as *rex et legifer noster*. We have merely an example of the figure *asteismus*, a scriptural trope familiar in Christian rhetoric (cf. Bede, *De Schematis et Tropis*. Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, xc, cols. 184-6). The motif of the Harrowing of Hell is also added naturally within the framework of the idea that Christ, the Saviour, comes to save both the living and the dead. Similarly in lyric XI the unity derives from the juxtaposition of two related ideas: the idea of the Saviour who comes within time and the idea of Christ, the second person of the Trinity, eternally present in the Mass. The prominence of time patterns in Old English poetry (to which S. B. Greenfield has already drawn attention in relation to these lyrics<sup>1</sup>) is no doubt to some extent due to the narrative form, since narrative implies a chronological framework. It may perhaps be noted that Schücking has observed in another connexion the prominence of time references in Old English poetry and connected them with a primitive narrative technique.<sup>2</sup>

The section on the language of the text, also, merits some general comment. Mr. Campbell himself is not unaware of the difficulties inherent in this kind of linguistic analysis and admits that 'the linguistic evidence presented . . . is extremely inconclusive'. The kind of problem involved can be illustrated by the word *degol* which is cited as Anglian but is stated to appear in some West Saxon prose manuscripts. Reference is made to Bülbring and Sievers-Brunner, but these authorities suggest merely that comparable forms appear in the *Cura Pastoralis* and in other West Saxon manuscripts and that the root vowel could

<sup>1</sup> 'The Theme of Spiritual Exile in *Christ I*', *P.Q.*, xxxiii (1953), 327-8.

<sup>2</sup> *Beowulf's Rückkehr* (Halle, 1905), pp. 16 ff.

also be due to late West Saxon smoothing. The fact is that we know very little about West Saxon, and it is clear to anyone who has collated, for example, the manuscripts of any of Ælfric's *Homilies* (especially the early and significant Royal manuscript) that the grammar books have relied excessively upon printed sources and taken too little account of problems of textual transmission. Late West Saxon as at present understood is something of a grammatical fiction. Two points of detail may be noted here: breaking before *l*+consonant can be Kentish and need not be West Saxon as implied on p. 37. The form *gereht* (past participle of *reccan*) could be late West Saxon as well as Anglian smoothing. The verb *gesleccan* (whose past participle *geslæhte* is cited on p. 39 as occurring only in Anglian texts) seems to be a *hapax legomenon*. Other examples are not cited in the dictionaries and, if there are other examples, references would have been useful. One can hardly count the problematical *slæce* in *Apollonius*.

The text and annotation are generally sensible and useful. Inevitably some of the suggestions are questionable. For example, the suggested reading for lyric IV. 7 seems to need justification. The suffix *-wise* in Old English is used to form nouns, not adjectives as Mr. Campbell's interpretation requires—for example, Ælfric on *munucwisan* (see *O.E.D.* under *Wise* sb.<sup>1</sup> 3), where the formation is clearly substantival. There are also points of translation which require comment. Thus *flint unbræcne* surely means 'unbreakable' rather than 'unbroken' flint. *Sundbuend* as a kenning for men is odd and could perhaps have been discussed. In lyric IX. 36, *wundurclommum bewripen* is not happily translated as 'wound round with wondrous chains' but must mean something more like the *fyrbendum fæst* of *Beowulf*, 722, or the *fæste . . . innan ond utan irenbendum* of *Beowulf*, 773 ff. *Clomm* means 'bond' and could be applied to either a band or a fetter. *Swegle gehyrste* is oddly translated as 'clothed with the sky'. The glossary, however, glosses *swegle* as 'celestially, splendidly', following Grein, and this seems to be the most satisfactory solution of the problem.

This is a useful book and likely to prove a welcome addition to recent critical reprints of Old English texts.

PAMELA GRADON

**Die 'Institutes of Polity, Civil and Ecclesiastical': ein Werk Erzbischof Wulfstans von York.** Edited by KARL JOST. Pp. 274 (Swiss Studies in English 47). Bern: Francke, 1959. Fr. 33.80.

By the much regretted death of Dr. Karl Jost Wulfstan studies have lost a most distinguished exponent, a pioneer in the investigations which have given the archbishop his rightful place not only as a scholar but as a statesman. Already in a review of Fehr's *Hirtenbriefe* in *Englische Studien* in 1918 and in an article 'Wulfstan und die angelsächsische Chronik' in *Anglia* in 1923, he showed that Wulfstan's authorship could be firmly established on stylistic grounds, and incidentally, in the second work, made possible a proper understanding of the origin of the northern recension of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. His article 'Einige Wulfstantexte und ihre Quellen', in *Anglia* in 1932, discussed several

important texts, and among other things added to the Wulfstan canon the so-called 'Canons of Edgar'; and finally, in his *Wulfstanstudien* (Swiss Studies in English 23 (1950)) he gave us a definitive study of the Wulfstan style, canon, and sources, which will remain the chief work of reference on this author. There remained only Wulfstan's *Institutes of Polity*, and all Anglo-Saxon scholars will be glad that he was able to bring out this edition before his death, even at the sacrifice of a study of its place in the history of political thought.

It has long been realized that the printed editions of this work were inadequate, not even letting one see its precise form in any manuscript. There are three main manuscripts, and occasional chapters occur in others. Jost's closely reasoned arguments allow one to postulate with great probability a first version, *I Polity*, best represented by Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS. 201 (D), to which a version in Cotton MS. Nero A 1 (G) adds a few extra chapters, and a revision, *II Polity*, contained in G (and in part in D), which has been expanded by a later compiler in Junius MS. 121 (X) with material which did not originally form part of the work, some of it from other works by Wulfstan, some from works of other writers. The versions in MSS. D and G also include some passages which are not part of the original. Jost has done great service in separating the real text from such accretions, and he has printed these accretions in an appendix, with the exception of *Episcopus*, which has already been well edited by Liebermann, though he did not assign it, as Jost does, to Wulfstan.

Cleared of the extraneous matter which has hitherto encumbered it, and with its chapters in their original arrangement (e.g. with §§ 35-40 of *I Polity* in the text, when Thorpe has them only in a footnote in vol. ii, p. 318), *Polity* can be seen to be, in its first form at least, a work with a degree of logical sequence and sense of shape not common in the eleventh century. While it bears clear signs of the author's familiarity with canonical writings, and borrows from Sedulius Scotus, Theodulf of Orleans, and Ælfric, there is no single main source, and the general impression it makes is of a work arising largely from the archbishop's own meditations on the conditions and requirements of his time. *I Polity* deals first with the duties of a king, takes over from Ælfric's *Treatise on the Old and New Testament* the doctrine of the three supports of the throne, *Oratores*, *Laboratores*, and *Bellatores*, and then passes on to the duties of those in authority, dealing first with the behaviour required of the highest ecclesiastical authorities, the bishops, and then with the duties connected with secular government by both ecclesiastical and lay magnates, earls, generals, reeves, judges, and experts in the law. A chapter on the duties of bishops includes a lament that too many people value their advice lightly; one with the rubric *Be eorlum*, but dealing in fact with judges in general, stresses the danger of corruption in the administration of justice. Chapters follow on priests, on men in orders, with the emphasis on the requirement of celibacy, abbots, monks, nuns (*minecean*), and, taken together, (secular) priests and women living under religious vows (*nunnan*). A chapter headed 'Concerning laymen' deals only with marriage, and, since second marriage is frowned on, is logically followed by one on widows. This consideration of one aspect of a layman's Christian duty leads to a chapter on his obligations to the church and on the respect due from the laity to the clergy. The work



concludes with a forceful chapter 'Concerning all Christian men', on the behaviour necessary to avoid the torments of hell and to merit the joys of heaven. It will be seen that the work is not a complete survey of the duties of all classes: those of the laity are discussed only in their religious aspect, except for the administration of justice by officials and magnates. The specific duties of thegns, *ceorlas*, and slaves are not part of the author's theme.

The first addition to the work is an initial chapter 'Concerning the heavenly King', with the consequent alteration of the following rubric to 'Concerning the earthly king'. Then in *II Polity* many additions were made, which sometimes upset the balance and lead to repetition, but have considerable interest. Substantial additions include a long passage, *II Polity*, §§ 43-57, which replaces *I Polity*, §§ 35-40, and is placed after the chapter *Be ðeodwitan* instead of before it, to avoid letting remarks on bishops be divided by those on leaders in general. It differs from the passage it replaces, which was content merely to outline a bishop's duty, in that it speaks of the penalties for non-compliance, and warns the laity against taking a bishop's sins as an excuse for disregarding his teaching. A long insertion, *II Polity*, §§ 77-84, begins with an interesting account of a bishop's 'daily work', but concludes with what is merely an expansion of *I Polity*, §§ 36 ff. It is to be regretted that Jost does not include among the sources to *II Polity* any reference to use of other parts of *I Polity*, for this conceals the extent of indebtedness of the second version to the first. *II Polity* follows the chapter inadequately headed *Be eorlum* in *I Polity* with one devoted to reeves, which has historical interest, for it is a nostalgic comparison with the better conditions before the death of King Edgar. The short chapter in *I Polity* (§§ 66 f.) on priests is enormously extended, in §§ 104-29 of *II Polity*, partly with a repetition of *I Polity*, §§ 47-50, on the duty of guarding the flock (there applied only to bishops, but here to all the priesthood), partly with an addition of the consequences of neglect of duty or of misapplying church money to the adornment of wives instead of using it for the adornment of the altar, or the support of the poor, or the redemption of captives. This is followed (with a new rubric *Be sacerdan* in D) by §§ 130-4 on the sanctity of priestly functions and their importance for the whole nation, and then by §§ 135-44 on the priests' responsibility and the account they must render on the Day of Judgement. To the chapter on men in orders in *I Polity*, the second version adds §§ 154-69, on celibacy, using the account given by Ælfric in his first pastoral letter of the pronouncements of church councils on this topic. Again, where *I Polity* simply states the behaviour fitting for monks, *II Polity*, §§ 178-84, indulges in a complaint on present conditions, in a passage with many expressions which are alien to Wulfstan's usage, which suggests that he is working over the text of some unknown writer. On the question of second marriages for the laity, *II Polity*, §§ 192-5, reinforces the disapproval of the first version by referring to the canonical prohibition of a blessing at such marriages and to the penance laid down for them. Finally, in § 222, and again in its final paragraph, *II Polity* adds 'and let us all support loyally one royal lord'. This surely has a bearing on the question of the date, for this plea is made in identical or similar terms in the codes drafted by Wulfstan in 1014 or later. It does not occur in the oldest

version of the code of 1008, and it is reasonable to suppose that it was the acceptance of Swegn as king in 1013 that accounts for Wulfstan's harping on this matter in his later writings.

If this suggestion is accepted, we get a date before 1013 for the first version of *Polity*. Jost points out that it cannot be before Ælfric's *Treatise on the Old and New Testament*, which he assigns to 1007-8; but Dr. Clemoes, in 'The Chronology of Ælfric's Works' (*The Anglo Saxons. Studies in some Aspects of their History and Culture presented to Bruce Dickins* (London, 1959)) suggests dating it 1005-6. This work did not appear until after Jost's death; but it is surprising that he should still accept 994 as the date of the second volume of Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*, with no reference to Dr. Sisam's demonstration, published in 1931, that this belongs to 991-2.

The appendix is by no means the least valuable part of this book, for several of its articles are of great interest, and some are made available for the first time. But it must be admitted that Jost has not made it easy to see which have not been printed before, and, moreover, an over-economy in cross-references makes it somewhat laborious to find his views on these items. It may therefore be of service briefly to consider them item by item, and to call attention to the importance of some of them. It should also be noted that even where these passages are in print already, it is a valuable service to have supplied them with a good critical apparatus.

Item (a) *Be godes peotum* (Thorpe, *Ancient Laws and Institutes*, ii. 324) is either by Wulfstan or made up of passages from his homilies; item (b) *Ad sacerdotes* (Thorpe, ii. 330 and 278-80) is made up of a Wulfstan homiletic beginning and some chapters from *Be dædbetan*, perhaps by Wulfstan working over somebody else's work; item (c), also with the rubric *Ad sacerdotes* (Thorpe, ii. 330-2), is probably a Wulfstan text, though its direct address and its requests for the hearers' prayers separate it from the impersonal style of *Polity*; item (d) is the so-called *Canons of Edgar* (Thorpe, ii. 244-58) which Jost showed in 1932 to be by Wulfstan; item (e) *Incipit de synodo* (Thorpe, ii. 316-18) is a collection of synodal decisions concerning the duties of bishops, written in Wulfstan's style throughout.

Of particular interest is item (f), *Be gehadedum mannum*, here printed for the first time, from MS. X. It consists of practical instructions concerning the examination of candidates for ordination to the priesthood, tacked on to a passage describing luridly the punishment awaiting the unchaste priest in hell, a passage which Jost ascribes to Ælfric, using the work of Ayto, *Liber de Visione et Obitu Wetini Monachi*; but the injunctions themselves, which I would begin at § 6, rather than § 7, have the marks of genuine Wulfstan work. They shed light on the condition of the English church in the eleventh century, showing the standard of ecclesiastical education desired for the priesthood, together with a realization that this cannot always be maintained. It may be necessary sometimes to ordain the 'half-taught', but in this event, they are to provide sureties that they will continue their studies after ordination.

Item (g), *De ecclesiasticis gradibus* (J. Raith, *Die alt- und mittellenglischen Apollonius-Bruchstücke* (Munich, 1956), pp. 16-20), also deals with ordination,

elaborating the theme that Christ in his life had symbolically represented all the seven orders of priesthood. It then enlarges on the duties of each order, explaining the symbolism of the presentation to each candidate at his ordination of an object suitable to his order. Though this text has some of Wulfstan's characteristics, it includes many words not used by him, and several also alien to Ælfric's usage, and hence Jost suggests that Wulfstan worked over a treatise of an unknown writer. In MS. X this text has been continued with a passage which Jost prints here as item (h), which occurs also at the end of the Ps.-Wulfstan homily, Napier No. XLVI. This, which deals with the risks in receiving alms on condition of doing penance for the donor's sins, is not in Wulfstan's style, and Jost believes that the archbishop would have condemned the whole practice. Item (j), *De regula canonicorum*, is a text discussed by Jost in *Anglia* in 1932, where he established Wulfstan's authorship.

As item (k), Jost makes more easily available what is to historians perhaps the most interesting passage in the whole volume. It comes in MS. D, in a text which begins like *II Polity*, §§ 130-4. The whole of the text has been available since 1937 in *Studies in Old English Manuscripts*, by Margareta Ångström (pp. 125 f.), but has received little attention. Jost considers that we have here the work of a compiler, using §§ 130-4 of *II Polity*, *Gepyncðo*, 5, *Grið*, 21.2-23, *I Polity*, § 119, and *II Cnut*, 84-84. 4b; but he does not seem to have considered the alternative possibility that it is an earlier work of Wulfstan, which he used in accordance with his normal practice when writing *Polity* and drafting laws. It seems to me to read as a consecutive whole, and its position in the manuscript, following immediately on what I consider to be the first draft of Cnut's laws, might support a view that it formed part of the material used by Wulfstan when drawing up the final form of Cnut's laws. Jost, however, in 1950, rejected my view that Wulfstan was the author of Cnut's laws, and he never replied to my later article which met his objections (*English Historical Review*, lxix (1955)). However, my present claim that the text under consideration is a work by Wulfstan himself, and not by a compiler, is not materially affected by the question whether he composed laws for Cnut. The section which is important for historians is that containing the following statement: 'And la, oft hit getimað, þæt þeowetlinge gecarnað freotes æt ceorle, and ceorl wyrð purh eorlgife þegenlage wyrðe, and þegn wurð purh cynincges gife eorldomes wyrðe.' The definite statement that a slave was often manumitted by a *ceorl* proves that many members of the latter class must have had considerable economic independence; the writer of this sentence could not make false statements in it without robbing it of all usefulness for the very purpose for which he composed it, i.e. to claim that clerics should receive greater rights and dignity as they received ecclesiastical preferment in exactly the same way as laymen did when they moved from a lower to a higher class. The sentence shows also that it was a fact, and not merely a theory or a pious wish, that a *ceorl* could become a thegn, and it is of great interest to learn that this change of status was accomplished 'by the earl's gift'. Finally, the sentence adds corroborating evidence that earls were appointed by the king.

The last item (l) is from MS. G, printed for the first time. It is a complaint over the misbehaviour of bishops, written by a bishop or archbishop, and Jost

attributes it to Wulfstan, though it does include a number of words which do not occur in his work, nor, in fact, anywhere else, namely, *willwyrdan*, *unman*, *fician*, *scandwyrde*, *unword*, *luffeorm*, and *ealusele*. Its most interesting passage is one which claims that bishops tend to flatter gleemen for fear of their scurrility.

Jost departs from the practice of recent editors of Wulfstan's work in printing much of *Polity* and of the texts in the appendix as verse, claiming that to do otherwise might cause Professor McIntosh's discovery on the rhythm of Wulfstan's prose to remain a dead theory. Yet in a section on Wulfstan's metre he discusses passages where to stress in accordance with McIntosh's theory does violence to the natural emphasis, and there are places in his own text where the arrangement as verse is difficult, and at times it breaks down altogether. While it is undoubted that Wulfstan usually uses short syntactical phrases containing two stresses, the printing of these as verse lines tends to obscure the subtler rhythms and distract attention from the building up of his periods. Yet this is a personal opinion which others may not share. In any case it detracts little from the value of an excellent edition, in which Jost rounds off his services to the study of an author whose reputation he did so much to establish.

DOROTHY WHITELOCK

**Arthurian Literature in the Middle Ages. A Collaborative History.** Edited by ROGER SHERMAN LOOMIS. Pp. xvi + 574. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959. 63s. net.

Whereas it was not impossible in 1923 for J. D. Bruce to tackle, alone, his *Evolution of Arthurian Romance from the Beginnings down to the Year 1300*, it is in 1959 inevitable that such a history should be collaborative; and in this book, which for most purposes replaces Bruce, thirty scholars of various nationalities have written forty-one chapters, a prologue, and an epilogue, to cover the whole field in all languages up to about 1500. Professor R. S. Loomis, a very good editor, has linked together by a measure of cross reference, and made more uniform by avowed and sometimes extensive revision, contributions which naturally and rightly still remain very different not only in content but also in method and emphasis. He has not only shaped but himself contributed seven chapters to what must prove to be one of the major works of scholarship in our day.

I shall first consider individually those five chapters in which I am rather more at home and then make some points about the book as a whole.

K. H. Jackson concludes in the first chapter, after a careful scrutiny of the few pieces of evidence, none of which is new, that 'Nothing is certain about the historical Arthur, not even his existence: however there are certain possibilities, even probabilities'. What R. G. Collingwood in *Roman Britain and the English Settlements* (1936, pp. 322-3) called a 'conjecture' that Arthur was 'a romanized Briton [who] . . . revived the office of *comes Britanniarum*' and led a band of heavy cavalry modelled on the latest Roman military practice, is rejected as 'seductive' and 'typical of a certain enthusiastic approach to Celtic historical

sources'. It was, however, on the whole corroborated by the apparently independent judgement of J. J. Parry in his unmentioned 'The historical Arthur', first printed in *J.E.G.P.*, lviii (1959), but delivered orally in 1936.

This probable 'supreme British commander of genius in the late fifth century who bore the Roman-derived name of Arthur' rapidly evolved in popular story into a miraculous emperor. This is how he is found in the late eleventh-century Welsh folk story of *Culhwch and Olwen*, the main theme of which is much the same as the legend of Jason and Medea. One of I. L. Foster's chapters considers this concisely, precisely, and with every care.

Mrs. Loomis's chapter on *Gawain and the Green Knight* is a model of compression, balance, sensitivity, and sense. A statement of Francis Berry's in the *Pelican Age of Chaucer* about the Green Knight as the representative of 'creative energy' and 'generic forces of life' is rightly called 'reckless', and a brief survey of probable sources and analogues points the difficulty that faces any theory—whether it be E. K. Chambers's or John Speirs's—that a fertility myth underlies and accounts for the life of the poem in that 'the Irish stories of the Challenge, the sources of *Gawain and the Green Knight*, . . . are not easily susceptible to interpretation as vegetation ritual'.<sup>1</sup> Appropriate emphasis is put on that aspect of the poem in which it is a shape-shifting faery story and on that other in which it is noble and morally earnest.

J. L. N. O'Loughlin gives good reason for believing the circulation of the alliterative *Morte Arthure* to have been wide despite its survival in one manuscript only, and makes some judicious comment on the relationship of the poem to contemporary history. It is good to learn that he has a new edition nearly ready. It is perhaps shortage of space that prevents his treating thoroughly and strenuously here big literary issues that cry for attention in this major poem, such as the quality and extent of the poet's originality and the role of Gawain as well as of Arthur. Mr. O'Loughlin asserts without any demonstration that Arthur's fall is 'brought about by the Aristotelian *hamartia* of his begetting of Mordred', but you could as well say it is that of unjustified war-making, for as the philosopher explains to Arthur at lines 3398-9,

Thow has schedde myche blode, and schalkes distroyede,  
Sakeles, in cirquytie [pride], in sere kynges landis.

But in neither explanation will any weight have been given to the characteristic concepts of the sheer arbitrariness of Fortune turning her wheel and of tragedy simply as a 'storie . . . of hym that stood in greet prosperitee|And is yfallen . . . into myserie'. There is far more here to be considered than one such provocative sentence can suggest.

We owe more of our appreciation of Malory to E. Vinaver than to any other scholar alive, and it would probably be unfair to expect the disintegrator of

<sup>1</sup> To the literature which Mrs. Loomis mentions that is concerned with myth in the poem should be added: J. Speirs's *Medieval English Poetry* (1957) in which the *Scrutiny* article referred to is now incorporated; C. Moorman, 'Myth and medieval literature: *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*', *Medieval Studies*, xviii (1956), 158-72; and A. M. Markman, 'The meaning of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*', *P.M.L.A.*, lxxii (1957), 574-86.



the *Morte Darthur* to present, as well as his own, the sort of case made out by D. S. Brewer in *Medium Aevum*, xxi (1952), for the unity of Malory's work; but the view that Malory's practical concept of chivalry is peculiarly his own ought to have been modified by J. A. W. Bennett's comment (in his review of the great edition in *R.E.S.*, xxv (1949)) that this is a characteristic of the English tradition in general. It might have been helpful to inform the reader unacquainted with the edition that, with regard to Malory's sources, in no case is the immediate exemplar known. E. K. Chambers with respect to the *Death of Arthur*, P. E. Tucker to the episode of the healing of Sir Urry, R. H. Wilson to the *Noble Tale of Sir Launcelot du Lake*, and W. F. Oakeshott to the *Book of Arthur and the Emperor Lucius* (see p. 543, n. 3, and p. 552, n. 1, and the additions in n. 1 below) have all concluded that the facts suggest an unknown intermediate source. W. F. Oakeshott, incidentally, notes the occurrence in the Winchester manuscript of red initials marking subdivisions, all of which, except one in his Book V, correspond with chapter divisions in Caxton.<sup>1</sup>

There are some one thousand topics in the index of this *History*, by no means too many for what is bound to be used considerably as a work of reference. It is strange that, for example, the following are not among them: 'Grail', 'Round Table', 'Fisher' or 'Maimed King', 'Waste Land'. It would have been helpful, also, to find 'Chivalry' or 'Love' in the index together with such questions of literary form as *entrelacement*; but the entries are almost entirely confined to names, real and fictitious, and titles of works.

It might have been wise to reduce the cost of the book by omitting the ten delightful photographs, the choice of which is nowhere explained and appears to be arbitrary.

Fifty spot checks spread through six chapters and the index reveal four errors in documentation and page reference, two almost insignificant but two momentarily confusing—p. 544, n. 4: J. A. W. Bennett's article is on p. 163 as well as 164; p. 542, n. 1: the relevance of the final page reference, xxvii, in Vinaver's edition of Malory is not apparent; p. 537, n. 5: L. B. Wright's article is in vol. xli (1926) not xl (1926) and p. 96 should read 97; *Camelot* is mentioned not on p. 177 but 176.

R. T. DAVIES

<sup>1</sup> The following might be included also in p. 552, n. 1, among the additions to the bibliography in the *Works*: R. T. Davies, 'Was Pellynor unworthy?', *N. & Q.*, n.s., iv (1957), 370; R. M. Lumianaky, 'Tristram's first interviews with Mark in Malory's *Morte Darthur*', *M.L.N.*, lxx (1955), 476-8; 'Two notes on Malory's *Morte Darthur*', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, lvi (1957), 148-53; 'Malory's use of *Le Morte Arthur* and *Mort Artu*', *Études Anglaises*, x (1957), 97-108; 'Malory's *Tale of Lancelot and Guinevere* as suspense', *Mediaeval Studies*, xix (1957), 108-22; D. C. Muecke, 'Some notes on Vinaver's *Malory*', *M.L.N.*, lxx (1955), 325-8; T. C. Rumble, 'The first explicit in Malory's *Morte Darthur*', *M.L.N.*, lxxi (1956), 564-6; J. Simko, 'A linguistic analysis of the Winchester Manuscript and William Caxton's edition of Sir Thomas Malory's "*Morte Darthur*"', *Philologica*, viii (1956); P. E. Tucker, 'A source for "The Healing of Sir Urry" in the "*Morte Darthur*"', *M.L.R.*, l (1955), 490-2; R. H. Wilson, 'Addenda on Malory's minor characters', *J.E.G.P.*, lv (1956), 567-87; 'How many books did Malory write?', *Univ. of Texas Studies in English*, xxx (1951), 1-23.

**The Parlement of the Thre Ages.** Edited by M. Y. OFFORD. Pp. xlviii+100 (Early English Text Society 246). London: Oxford University Press for the Society, 1959. 28s. net.

*The Parlement of the Thre Ages* has survived in two manuscripts now in the British Museum, the mid-fifteenth-century Thornton Miscellany and the Ware Miscellany written perhaps a generation later. Only the version in the Thornton manuscript is complete. Both texts were printed for the Roxburghe Club in 1897 and the Thornton text reprinted (with some variants from the Ware) in *Select Early English Poems* in 1915. But there was clear need for an edition with a fuller apparatus, and this has at last been filled.

There is a detailed consideration of the phonology, accident, dialect, and metre of the poem. This edition began as a research thesis under the supervision of Miss Dorothy Everett and her influence is still apparent. Perhaps the section on dialect is the least satisfactory. It is often presupposed that there is adequate evidence for the language spoken in well-defined zones and that authors continued to compose in the dialect of their origin. Both may be queried. In a great magnate's household, in many religious houses (notably among the friars), and in each study centre quite different forms of childhood dialect must often have blended into some transient form of *Koine*. M. S. Serjeantson considered that the author of the *Parlement* was possibly from Nottinghamshire. J. P. Oakden inclined to an area near the Ribble Valley. For Mrs. Offord the poet's dialect could have been that of the central or southern part of the West Riding. The search ends inconclusively.

It is perhaps also worth querying another presupposition inherited from the English studies of about 1900—that it is possible to show from intrinsic evidence alone that two distinct medieval English poems were written by the same author. It is this that led Gollancz and Kölbing to the conclusion that the same poet wrote the *Parlement* and *Wynner and Wastoure*. Mrs. Offord states more tentatively that the *Parlement* was either written by the author of *Wynner and Wastoure* or by one who knew *Wynner and Wastoure* well. The resemblances could be explained if both poets, deliberately using the traditional phraseology of alliterative verse, possessed a common source (or sources).

But there are still two lines of research which might be followed profitably: the social status of the public for whom the poem was intended and the extent of the learning of the poet. The *Parlement* would have been intelligible to a restricted circle conversant not only with courtly usage but with all the French technical terms for hawking and venery and fashions in dress, as perhaps in *Gawayne* a class dialect seems to be surcharged on a rather fluid vernacular. Such a public seems likely to have been some magnate's household probably in the Midlands or in the North. In a medieval category it is a 'learned' poem; the purpose is didactic. The author is eager to display a detailed knowledge. He slips naturally into Church Latin. He is familiar with the clerical tradition of the 'Disputatio' as well as with a repertory of romances. He can refer to Caesar and to Virgil and to Diocletian. In the widest sense of that term he was a 'clerk'. But since he still conceives of Virgil as a magician rather than as a poet he was not a highly trained one.

GERVASE MATHEW

**Chaucer and the French Tradition. A Study in Style and Meaning.** By CHARLES MUSCATINE. Pp. x+282. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press; London: Cambridge University Press, 1957. 30s. net.

It has taken the present reviewer some time to come to terms with this book and—to borrow a typical phrase—its complicated optics. Neologisms such as 'attitudinal', 'meaning-function', 'uniplanar', and Auerbachian dicta such as 'the stylistic structure of the *Troilus* is co-extensive with its meaning' at first blind one to its many incidental merits. It transpires that by 'French' Mr. Muscatine really means 'Gothic', a term that has been absent from Chaucer criticism since the time of Warton and Blake; but he ignores the possibility that in literature as in art pre-Chaucerian England may have given as well as taken; and the effort to fit *Troilus* into a late Gothic frame of reference involves the unsupported suggestion (p. 128) that it is shadowed by the Hundred Years' War and social and religious turmoil. (It also involves identifying Boccaccio with the Renaissance in a way that no reader of Branca's *Boccaccio medievale* can allow.) Self-consciously modern—not least in his search for multiple meanings—Mr. Muscatine rightly minimizes Chaucer's modernity and rightly deprecates the tendency to describe convention wholly in organic terms. He notes that the realism of the fabliaux is no less conventional than courtly epic, and in the tales of the Miller and the Reeve he sees Chaucer deliberately elaborating fabliau properties to create a world and evoke an attitude: the miller is made a vessel [*sic*] of posterously inflated social and intellectual pretensions, the realism of the Canon's Yeoman's Tale is 'ultimately symbolic'—which appears to mean that the tale's very texture and imagery, like the Yeoman's intrusion into the pilgrimage, evoke a sense of the futile materialism of false alchemy.

Mr. Muscatine is more concerned with traditions of style than with sources in the narrow sense. His crispest chapters are those illustrating French courtly and bourgeois traditions and such aspects of them as the shift from dialogue to Jean de Meun's dramatic monologues. He sees Chaucer as exploiting 'those nexuses between style and meaning which are characteristic of those traditions'—a generalization that helps us less than a comparison, say, of Dido's lament in the *Eneas* and in the *House of Fame* would have done. It is a slight danger of this approach that it leads us to ignore Chaucer's positive effect on courtly style, possibly (as C. S. Lewis has lately suggested) even on courtly manners. The *Tales*, separately and as a whole, are regarded as exemplifying the 'mixed style'—which indeed might be said of the Gothic architecture of Canterbury itself. But Mr. Muscatine's comment that it is hard to draw the line between the art and the algebra in the *Tales* is applicable to parts of his own book. It is a pity that his considerable critical virtues are sometimes smothered in academic fustian 'of the newe jet': for whenever he attends to detail—and notably in discussing the tales of the Merchant and the Miller—he is as illuminating as he is modest.

J. A. W. BENNETT

**MS. Bodley 959: Genesis-Baruch 3.20 in the Earlier Version of the Wycliffite Bible.** Vol. I, Genesis and Exodus. Edited by CONRAD LINDBERG. Pp. 214 (Stockholm Studies in English 6). Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1959. Kr. 25.00.

For textual study of the Wycliffite Bible the most important single manuscript is MS. Bodley 959, not printed by Forshall and Madden (FM), though by them believed to be the original manuscript of the earlier version (EV). Their belief has been claimed as untenable by Dr. Fristedt in his challenging but difficult Stockholm Study, and now in the same series Dr. Lindberg publishes material that will enable the student to judge the matter for himself. His volume is the first of four or five which are planned to make available all the contents of the manuscript at the rate of one volume for each scribe, and its main function is to provide a close reproduction of the text of the first two biblical books—a close reproduction, it is claimed, not a diplomatic text. Contractions are expanded silently, as italics are reserved for corrections and additions by a second hand, and colons stand for both 'inverted semi-colons' and normal colons. (This, it seems, is principally what is meant by the modest statement, 'The punctuation is only approximate'.) Accents show additions by the original hand; asterisks mark erasures; footnotes call attention to every alteration, assigning each to the original or a different hand and ink; end-notes record the preferred and variant readings of the Vatican Vulgate and variant readings from most of and often from all the other manuscripts of EV.

When such care has been taken with the text, it seems a pity that the potential significance of one scribal feature has not been exploited. The introduction notes, 'Folios 1-15r (incl.) have been retraced', keeping FM's verb. On these folios the original ink was a very pale brown; this can still be seen in chapter numbers, the letters to guide the rubricator, and occasionally where a mistake has been expuncted by the scribe. When the 'retracing' is done in a later ink, only the actual text is darkened, and earlier expunctions are often crossed through. Is it too fanciful to suggest that here we have evidence of the scribe's method of work? As he starts to make a fair copy of the prologue and first chapters of Genesis from a rough version or notes, he uses a pale ink as a modern scholar might use pencil, in case he needs to alter it later. With a good portion written, he looks back over his work, sees few alterations, submits it for approval to his superiors or colleagues and, having darkened the approved version as a modern scholar would ink his in, goes on thenceforward to make his fair copy in the darker ink. Later still, either he or another with a still darker ink goes through these fifteen folios with the rest, making changes in the translation, the language, and the punctuation.

Dr. Lindberg's examination of the language of the first scribe shows principally East Midland forms, with one strong West Midland feature in *nome* and isolated Northern and Southern features. This mixture cannot be said to give much support either to Derbyshire as the source of the manuscript (p. 15) or to Nicholas of Hereford as the translator (p. 23). His responsibility must be based on different evidence. As for the suggestion that he may have used a French Bible as well as the Vulgate, it is supported by such slight evidence that it should

hardly find a place in the conclusions. But much of the introduction is necessarily provisional; publication of the rest of the manuscript may lead to modifications, and this first instalment, soundly edited, of a vital manuscript will be welcome material for students of the Wycliffite Bible.

HENRY HARGREAVES

**The Praise of Pleasure. Philosophy, Education, and Communism in More's *Utopia*.** By EDWARD SURTZ, S.J. Pp. x+246. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957; London: Oxford University Press, 1958. 38s. net.

This work and its companion *The Praise of Wisdom* (Chicago, 1957; see *R.E.S.*, N.S. x (1959), 301-3) offer the most detailed historical interpretation of the *Utopia* so far available. Instead of treating More as an early Marxist, democrat, anti-imperialist, welfare officer, or as the inventor of a genre that was to have a fruitful future, they place him firmly as a Christian humanist addressing the Europe of his day. The ideas in the book are closely documented by comparisons with More's other writings (including judicious use of the letters) and with those of the ancients, of Aquinas, Scotus, and Antoninus, of Pico, Ficino, Vives, Colet, and (above all) Erasmus. The present volume deals with three Utopian topics which are shown to be intimately related: the philosophy of pleasure, the study of Greek, and communism. The demonstration is lucid and beautifully articulated. It is further argued that this complex of ideas is not in the first instance presented for its own sake but is a technique, a strategy, by which the reformer hopes to highlight the evils of his world. In effect Father Surtz is elaborating the famous comment made by R. W. Chambers in 1935: 'The virtues of Heathen Utopia show up by contrast the vices of Christian Europe.' In other words, 'if pagans with the aid of reason can create a noble nation where it is better to be a slave than elsewhere to be a free citizen, Christians with the additional help of God's revelation and Christ's grace can eliminate all injustice and hate and build a new Jerusalem . . .'. Father Surtz confesses that *Utopia* interests him primarily as a work of art; and one great virtue of his book is that it unobtrusively establishes the nature and value of the art of More while apparently intent on quite another matter. More's method of persuasion is by indirection, irony, wit. The 'kind' to which *Utopia*, like *The Praise of Folly*, really belongs is the *declamation*, with (among other traditional features) its exploitation of the rhetoric of paradox.

The first paradox, the Utopian definition of 'the end and felicity' of human life as pleasure, is part of the rehabilitation of Epicurus which had begun in the fifteenth century. When true pleasure is seen as delight in the highest goods and contempt for such greeds and extravagances as Europeans are prey to, hedonism becomes an ennobling philosophy. Ficino even claims in one place to reconcile it with Plato's words, and indeed the whole conception takes on Platonic and religious colouring, with something like a beatific vision after death as its summit. Since Father Surtz wrote Professor Edgar Wind has explored



the question from the standpoint of the visual arts in *Pagan Mysteries in the Renaissance* (London, 1958, pp. 69 ff., &c.). And so the ordered life of the pleasure-loving pagans puts Christian materialism to shame. A prime source of their recognition of true pleasure is 'good literature and learning'; and so it is natural that they should open-mindedly welcome Hythloday's 'pretty fardel' of Greek books, in contrast with the obscurantist and conservative hostility to Greek studies among so many of More's contemporaries. Greek and Greek texts were felt to lead *ad fontes*, to the real, to questions of substance, away from the sterility of scholastic logic and its pursuit of subtleties as ends in themselves. 'Right learning' makes better men, not better disputants. It mends the divorce of head and heart. It is an intellectual salvation. Significantly it is Plato's *Republic* which excites most interest among the Utopians, because of its advocacy of communism. The Utopians' rejection of private property is grounded, however, squarely on their own notions of true pleasure, since joy in possession is a false joy and begets pride, self-interest, avarice, and indifference to others' pleasure—as is proved in Europe by the miseries that flow from monopoly, usury, enclosures, and the rest. Here we have an instance of how original and creative was the humanists' use of their classical models. More important, here (as with the attack on the Schoolmen) is a clear illustration of More's strategic rather than self-committed use of ideas, since he was no advocate of communism as a social programme. Father Surtz's distinctions are specially useful on this point. Communism as a prelapsarian (and also primitive Christian) ideal is perfectly consistent with the practical and theological defence of private property in More's work against Luther in 1523. The intricate background of thought here analysed helps us to understand why the *caritas*-preaching Langland (*P.P.*, xx. 271 ff.) and the Platonist Spenser on Justice (*F.Q.*, v. ii) both bitterly reject common ownership—in the interests of true order.

It is a rare delight to read a work of scholarship as worthy of 'the sweet and humane reasonableness' of its subject as this one is.

J. C. BRYCE

**The Professional Writer in Elizabethan England. A Study of Non-dramatic Literature.** By EDWIN HAVILAND MILLER. Pp. xvi+282. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1959. 40s. net.

This study does not alter materially the picture painted by Miss Sheavyn in *The Literary Profession in the Elizabethan Age* (1909); but Mr. Miller makes full use of the wealth of new information which has come to light during the past fifty years on the two subjects which have most bearing on the livelihood of the writer who hoped to live by his pen: his relations to patrons, and the rewards he might hope to receive from the stationers. Mr. Miller takes account of the two most important recent works on patronage: Mr. Buxton's *Sir Philip Sidney and the English Renaissance* and Miss Rosenberg's *Leicester Patron of Letters*. He

rightly questions Miss Rosenberg's too frequent assumption that Leicester approved in advance works dedicated to him. Evidence on the relations of writers to dedicatees is hard to come by; but Mr. Miller assembles what there is. He cites Churchyard's statement that sixteen (about half) of his dedications brought in no reward. If we cannot deduce patronage from the fact that a book is dedicated to a man, it can at least be said that ninety-four books would scarcely have been dedicated to Leicester if he had been known to dislike, and never to reward, this form of attention. Miss Rosenberg is probably right in suggesting that preferment rather than monetary reward is what authors expected of him.

Mr. Miller estimates that £1 was the average figure paid by a patron for a dedication. The most valuable evidence on the rewards of literature, because it covers money received both from patrons and from sales, is the translator Robinson's *Eupolemia*. For dedications to thirty-one books he received £24. 6s. 4d. Robinson did not receive payment for his books from the stationers, but ordinarily they gave him twenty-six free copies, which he then sold. Mr. Miller's estimate (£29. 11s. 1d.) indicates that the copies for sale were rather more remunerative than the dedications; he deduces that salesmanship was essential to the survival of an author; but evidence is very scanty. His conjecture that when John Stow received for *The Survey of London* £3 and forty copies, and for *Brief Chronicles* £1 and fifty copies, he did not have to sell his books at exorbitant prices in order to realize more than his publishers paid him can be confirmed from the payments made to Howes and Munday for copies of their *Chronicles* by various City Companies. But here again the difficulty of making generalizations is illustrated by the different sums paid for the same book; Howes's *Chronicle* brought in sums ranging from £2. 4s. od. to £5; the receipts of Munday's widow for copies of her husband's revision of Stow's *Survey* varied from £1 to £3 (see *Malone Society Collections III*, pp. 175-81).

Mr. Miller produces evidence to show that writers such as Greene, Nashe, Harvey, and Dekker received not more than £2 for one of their pamphlets from the stationers. In view of this figure and of the £6 or so which one of Henslowe's hacks might hope to receive for a play, which was considerably longer and more difficult to write, Mr. Miller's decision to omit the dramatists from his study on the grounds that rewards were much better in the theatres than in the printing houses would appear to be ill judged. It is true that most dramatists evinced little interest in publication, but then they had already parted with their financial interest in their plays to the acting companies. Their plight without performing rights was quite as dire as that of the writers without copyright. Furthermore, dramatists and writers were often the same people, and a consideration of what Nashe, Greene, Chapman, or Dekker could earn by their pens which excludes the plays they wrote for performance is scarcely a full picture. The possibility should also be added of being paid like Peele, Munday, or Dekker for writing speeches for city pageants; or like Daniel and Jonson for court masques. Mr. Miller touches on these additional sources of income for a writer (pp. 209-10), but nowhere attempts to use the readily available figures for earnings from them. Professional writers like Chapman and Dekker who wrote for the stage were not noticeably better off than those like Breton who did not. Mr. Miller is driven

to suppose that only Shakespeare, Spenser, and Jonson combined artistic genius with business acumen. However, he reaches the comforting conclusion that the greatest writers of the age were the most favoured. Queen Elizabeth took a personal interest in the welfare of John Dee, Camden, and Spenser; and several other writers got pensions or intermittent help from patrons—but only Daniel and Jonson obtained continuing support from this source. Others either retired from the fray to more lucrative and restful professions, such as the Church or farming, or struggled on perpetually in debt and sometimes, like Greene or Harvey, as virtual prisoners of the stationers who employed them.

Mr. Miller has assembled a great deal of material from a wide range of sources for which all workers in this field will be grateful. In spite of his initial quotation from Holinshed warning off fault-finders, a protest must be entered against his suggestion (p. 42) that there were no provincial bookshops outside Oxford and Cambridge, and against the description of Sir Robert as Philip Sidney's son (p. 80). Mr. Miller's style is a trifle excitable (we are invited at one point (p. 64) to contemplate presidents, executives, professors, and the white-collar class *literally* devouring detective stories); but I should prefer in conclusion 'to blaze out his good deserts'.

JEAN ROBERTSON

**Divine Poetry and Drama in Sixteenth Century England.** By LILY B. CAMPBELL. Pp. viii+268. Berkeley and Los Angeles: California University Press; London: Cambridge University Press, 1959. 35s. net.

The purpose and partly the effect of Miss Campbell's labours is to raise a mass of semi-submerged literature and give it the reconsideration it deserves. Two of her authors came in for a contemporary witticism: 'Locke and Hudson, sleepe, you quiet shavers, among the shavings of the presse, and let your bookes lye in some old nookes amongst old bootes and shooes, so you may avoid my censure.' She is to ask whether the jibe was just, and her own evident fair-mindedness gives confidence continually. Here is a seemly small book but it represents a vast quantity of reading, much of it unrewarding as far as emergent merit is concerned. Among her authors stands Baldwin with his paraphrases of the *Canticles or Balades of Solomon*; the bulky Du Bartas translated by royal and plebeian admirers and influencing many; Henry Lok; the forgotten William Forrest; and much of the less-well-known work of Drayton, Nashe, and Lodge. As 'divine dramas' it is her lot to deal with the plays of Bale, Grimald, and Buchanan before coming to the wrongfully neglected *Jacob and Esau* and Peele's *David and Fair Bethsabe*. Many titles remind us of what is lost. Much that is pertinent is in Latin and since Miss Campbell takes pains to keep the continental precedents, connexions, and parallels in view we are indirectly concerned with the Dutch Prodigal Son plays and the industry of Jesuit dramatists. But there is no place found for Southwell and the body of Recusant poetry, and only with difficulty is Constable brought into the picture. Alabaster's sonnets were, of course, hardly available when this study was made but I suspect that these too would have been cut off

by the edges of the frame. In spite of the title's adjective it is evident that what this book deals with is poetry and drama based on the Bible. This is made plain with regard to the poetry on p. 74 and for the drama on p. 144. It would still seem a little misleading to cling to 'Divinae' which then and now has a rather wider reference. It is Miss Campbell's contention that there was a deliberate literary movement characterized by the material used but taking advantage of any form—narrative, lyrical, or dramatic—that was available. It was a movement to substitute sacred for secular literature with edification as its aim. She can cite many a vehement plea from prefaces and the theory is undeniable. As far as practice is concerned it would seem that what was accomplished was a substantial supplementing rather than a substitution. Note, for instance, the number of authors who wrote in both kinds: Wyatt, Surrey, Sidney, Spenser, Harrington, and Drayton, not to mention the dramatists paid by Henslowe. There is an obvious inference to be drawn. One might question whether this sharp severance of Christian from pagan is really in place when recalling the Christian implications of the apparently pagan stories of the 'Arcadia' on the one hand and the popular exploiting of Biblical themes inveighed against by Puritan critics on the other. Plainly the talents were on the secular side, as equally plainly the case was to be reversed in the next century.

Miss Campbell begins along chronological lines and then decides to continue according to the Scriptural books that are dealt with: the Psalms, the Song of Songs, and Biblical narratives. She then turns to gather up the remainder according to the *genres* used by the English writers. The case for the drama is unfolded from continental Latin to vernacular, thence to translation and imitation in English schools and universities, first in the ancient languages and then in English, coming at length by way of plays supposedly for special audiences to the two surviving examples of Biblical subjects presented in the public theatre. She is surely right to plead for a reconsideration of the theories of a Christian Terence and Seneca as commonly accepted from Herford and Chambers on the basis of the wider view that can now be commanded of continental drama, but this would argue a modification rather than a refutation of the older views. It is true that there were Catholics as well as Protestants using Biblical material and that the Terentian and Senecan models were not the only ones, but Miss Campbell's reader will note how by frequent small concessions, now of date of composition, now of circumstances of publication, or of fame as compared with priority in time, and so forth, she too admits the strong Reformer bias in English production. Or again, the group taken as Prodigal Son plays is so strongly affected by the allegorical style that it could be regarded as the continuation and adaptation of Morality Drama just as reasonably as an instance of the new crop of Reformed Bible plays. The like might be said for the extraordinary 'tadpole' condition of what survives of Bale's production which, given his career and successive persuasions, is perhaps not so strange as modern taste would make it appear. All the same it is interesting and profitable to have these plays presented from a different angle and it is certainly valuable to be brought to see Spenser's last *Hymn* in the company of a critic who has so strong a conviction of the reality of the cult of Urania that she can see the figure of Sapience as a natural expression of a way of

thought which is more impressive than one poet's idiosyncrasy, however attractive that may be.

To read this careful assembling and honest scrutiny of matter poor and indifferent, often dull, and occasionally good is to make one grateful for the provision of a more reliable background than has hitherto been provided, or is likely to be earned by many who profess to study and enjoy Elizabethan poetry and drama. It should serve as ballast to the 'proud, full sail' of the greater verse.

K. M. LEA

**The Spanish Tragedy.** By THOMAS KYD. Edited by PHILIP EDWARDS. Pp. lxx+154 (The Revels Plays). London: Methuen, 1959. 18s. net.

The reading public envisaged for the Revels Plays is not specified, but one had imagined that the series was partly designed to achieve a wider currency of appeal for somewhat 'academic' plays. Philip Edwards's edition of *The Spanish Tragedy* puzzles expectation. The collation and textual commentary seem to be tailored for the non-scholarly reader; the collation is deliberately economical (for example, obvious misprints in the 1592 text are not recorded) and the textual commentary is firmly directed towards readers little advanced in Elizabethan English. However, the introduction has a marked scholarly bias, four-fifths being devoted to a patient sifting of evidence concerning textual difficulties, dating, authorship of the Additions, and associated matters. Of course, the problems are there, but since they are so intractable as to end in mere nescience or doubtful conjecture one must wish that their treatment had been curtailed, perhaps to be dealt with more fully in article form, so as to release space for critical considerations of wider appeal. Mr. Edwards evidently wishes the reader to see the play as a thing of some intrinsic merit, and he regrets that he has said so little about the language of the play. One echoes his regret, for recent advances in the study of Elizabethan linguistic techniques give reason to expect significant discussion of Kyd's language in a new major edition of *The Spanish Tragedy*. The factual bias is the more regrettable because Mr. Edwards proves that he might have achieved a shift in the customary apologetic approach to the play; the short section devoted to 'Theme and Structure', demonstrating admirably the unity of the play's several revenge actions, is a positive gain in appreciation.

The editor rejects as inconclusive all evidence so far advanced for a pre-1589 date for *The Spanish Tragedy*. He argues convincingly that the absence of any reference in the play to the Armada does not necessitate a date of composition prior to 1588. He follows R. B. McKerrow and I. Duthie in challenging the supposed reference to the play in Nashe's Preface to Greene's *Menaphon* (S.R., 23 August 1589). He is scrupulous; yet a combination of factors in the Nashe passage will continue to suggest Kyd to many readers: and if Kyd, then possibly *The Spanish Tragedy*. Nashe's reference to 'French Dowdie' cannot be lightly dismissed as smut. Why not a *double entendre*? And Jonson's allusion is surely reliable enough to establish at least an *upward* limit of 1589? Mr. Edwards



tentatively suggests debts to *Tamburlaine*, part II, and Watson's English Elegy on Walsingham, *Meliboeus*, both hinting at a 1590 dating. His 'firm preference' for a date around 1590 seems, however, to derive from his impression of the literary qualities of the play.

This edition is, of course, based upon the good 1592 text of Edward White. The editor suggests that textual corruption in the last part of the play, and the presence side by side of alternative versions of the play-within-the-play material and the conclusion, represent contamination of the manuscript copy for 1592 by the debased printed text of Abel Jeffes, derived probably from a theatrical report. It is suggested that the reference to the 'unknown languages' in which the playlet is to be performed, a promise never fulfilled, derives from Jeffes's text, a stage abridgement in which Kyd's original playlet was replaced by a mime accompanied by some gibberish or 'sundry languages'. Similarly, Hieronimo's vow of silence which nonsensically follows his long explanation of the playlet's atrocities is a shortened alternative conclusion from Jeffes's text. The hypothesis is persuasive. However, the theory of abridgement can only be satisfactory if one postulates that it extended to other parts of Jeffes's text, since the saving of time on the playlet and the vow-of-silence ending is marginal. One would like, at least, to think that Kyd designed such abridgements, for the 'mere confusion' of the 'sundry languages' well accords with Hieronimo's feigned madness, and the vow-of-silence ending is theatrically most effective.

Mr. Edwards has not regularized Elizabethan syntax or Kyd's English, a justifiable conservatism where the copy for 1592 is presumed to have been authorial manuscript. Spelling and punctuation are modernized as mainly representing printing-house practice. Readers will be grateful that the 1602 Additions are banished to the end of the main text—not as worthless but as hindering appreciation of the original shaping of the play.

This edition provides an excellent text for reading and playing, but it does little to reanimate one's estimate of Kyd.

R. F. HILL

**Shakespeare's Festive Comedy. A Study of Dramatic Form and its Relation to Social Custom.** By C. L. BARBER. Pp. x+266. Princeton: University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1959. 40s. net.

Professor Barber has written a book which for its outlook, if not for its argument, ought to be read by all who wish to see Shakespearian comedy not simply as a hangover from medieval romance or a variant from Molière classicism but as a thing in itself. The approach is in the line of that unjustly neglected scholar, C. R. Baskerville; that is, via the traditional and popular entertainments of the time; this has the obvious advantage of allowing Mr. Barber to be both historical and formalist in his treatment, to see Shakespeare as a child of his age, yet to assess his works as independent creations which speak to the festive spirit in any age.

Comparison with Baskerville throws up a difference between the two authors which is partly, no doubt, one of temperament, but is also one of generation.

Baskerville painstakingly collected evidence and did little about general theories which might comprehend it; Mr. Barber has no evidence which is not easily available elsewhere and is slipshod in the minutiae of scholarship which the earlier generation held sacred. His interests do not lie here, nor do his virtues. He is concerned with popular entertainment not as historical record but as anthropological statement of basic human situations:

To get at the form and meaning of the plays, which is my first and last interest, I have been led into an exploration of the way the social form of Elizabethan holidays contributed to the dramatic form of festive comedy. To relate this drama to holiday has proved to be the most effective way to describe its character. And this historical interplay between social and artistic form has an interest of its own: we can see here, with more clarity of outline and detail than is usually possible, how art develops underlying configurations in the social life of a culture. (pp. 4 f.)

The anthropological approach to literature is by now an old story, but Shakespearean comedy has not proved a particularly fruitful field for its application. One reason why the age of *Quellenforschung* may have found difficulty is suggested in an illuminating footnote (p. 194). Mr. Barber is discussing Janet Spens's 1916 *Essay on Shakespeare's Relation to Tradition*, and he points out the difficulty in Miss Spens's method that 'the plots, abstracted from the concrete emphasis of their dramatic realization, can be adjusted to square with an almost unlimited range of analogies'. Mr. Barber suggests that the case is altered, and the whole range of his book supports the suggestion, if we focus not on the plot-material and its alleged folk-play sources, but on 'the rhythm of feeling and awareness in the audience which is focused through complementary roles in the fable and implemented by concrete patterns of language and gesture', that is, on the play as a means of organizing responses which show themselves elsewhere (less ambiguously) in holiday customs.

Mr. Barber's anthropology, in short, is of the school of Margaret Mead rather than that of Sir James Frazer: he is concerned with the modernity rather than the antiquity of ritualistic responses; and one must welcome his stressing 'the fact that the holiday occasion and the comedy are parallel manifestations of the same pattern of culture, of a way that men can cope with life', if only because it helps to rehabilitate the much-maligned groundlings. But it provides for us as well a mode of understanding the balance of attitudes inside any single play—its setting of clown against king, or lust against love, as custom set the boy bishop against the real bishop or the winter king against the real lord of the manor.

To see the difficulties of the approach via source-study is, however, rather more simple than to escape from them. Mr. Barber makes it clear that his book treats both 'correspondence between the whole festive occasion and the whole comedy' and 'detailed connections between the holidays and the comedies', and has no doubt that the former is the more important. If this is so, then the 'detailed connections' which occupy most of the book—*Rosalind* involved in a 'disguising', Sir Toby as a lord of misrule, *Love's Labour's Lost* as a courtly revel, *Midsummer-Night's Dream* as a 'maying' adventure—ought to be used to reinforce the general topic; but in fact most of them are simply plot analyses in the

light of festival customs, concerned with the organization of material rather than the organization of responses. There is, in short, a gap between intention and achievement; the intention is persuasive and attractive, but the whole book does not reflect it, and much of its exposition remains at the level of abstract critical jargon—some examples may have been noticed in the quotations already given.

The failure I have pointed to should not, however, be over-emphasized; it is really the failure to write the great central book on Shakespearian comedy we are all waiting for. What remains (even leaving Mr. Barber's central idea on one side) is a series of highly intelligent observations on a number of comedies. Mr. Barber is especially persuasive when handling questions of the balance of comedy with romance. It is just here that many critics push their theses into improbability: enjoying Falstaff, they feel obliged to reject Hal; supposing Sly to be real, they condemn Lucentio as unreal. Mr. Barber suggests that 'the humorous perspective can be described as looking past the reigning festive moment to the work-a-day world beyond' (p. 13). This can be seen to be a useful way of affirming the reality of both idyllic love-emotions and down-to-earth critics. It enables Mr. Barber, for example, to relegate to its proper status all the talk about 'satire' in *As You Like It*:

neither Jaques, the amateur fool, nor Touchstone, the professional, ever really gets around to doing the satirist's work of ridiculing life as it is. . . . what they make fun of instead is what they can find in Arden—pastoral innocence and romantic love, life as it might be, lived 'in a holiday humour'. . . . his clown and fool comedy is a response, a counter-movement, to artistic idealization. (p. 229)

In such paragraphs the original idea, handled in a general way, yields large critical dividends. It may seem churlish, in consequence, to regret that the book has turned into a series of essays grouped round the idea, and does not become what once it seemed to promise—a rigorous pursuit of the nature of Shakespearian comedy.

G. K. HUNTER

**Troilus and Cressida.** Edited by J. DOVER WILSON and ALICE WALKER. Pp. lxx+254 (The New Shakespeare). Cambridge: University Press, 1957.

**The Life of Timon of Athens.** Edited by J. DOVER WILSON and J. C. MAXWELL. Pp. lvi+190 (The New Shakespeare). Cambridge: University Press, 1957. 18s. net each.

Dr. Walker's handling of the state of the text of *Troilus and Cressida* is so brief and lucid that one wonders what all the fuss has been about. The interest lies in watching the hypothesis, groomed and tested by herself and by other distinguished scholars, at work. Q, it appears, is a transcript of foul papers, probably prepared for the Inns of Court. The first three pages of F are from an uncorrected copy of Q, and the rest from a copy corrected from the Company's foul papers. Q is marred by the errors of the scribe and of Eld's two compositors

(the brash *A* and the servile *B*), and *F* by the collator's errors and those of Jaggard's compositors (here the brash *B* and servile *A*). After weeding out the errors the editor must prefer *Q* for accidental and *F* for substantive variants. In practice this means preferring *F* where substantive readings are equally matched (e.g. *F* 'pray thee'; *Q* 'prethee') and elsewhere making choice of the 'better' reading from either text. It seems that the hypothesis controls our rationalization of a choice rather than the choice itself.

Dr. Walker cannot here attempt to explain all the anomalies. *Q*'s omission, for example, of Agamemnon's welcome to Hector (IV. v. 165-70) is recorded but not accounted for. Chambers thought the lines illegible in *Q*'s copy, while Tannenbaum took them for Shakespeare's revision. Dr. Walker would presumably agree with Chambers, but the postulate of a 'very foul transcript' less legible than the foul papers is not easily admitted. A 'naïve transcriber' would be more likely to omit passages illegible in the foul papers, and if this indeed happened, the collator who restored the passages to *F* must have been a more conscientious worker than Dr. Walker allows.

Still, the difficulties are theoretical and editors of different persuasions are apt to agree on particular preferences. Dr. Walker's text is confessedly 'eclectic' and on only about a score of occasions does it look daring or unfamiliar. This happens when emendations are made to errors believed common to *Q* and *F*. Some are minor but distinct improvements of grammar and rhetoric ('flee' for 'fled' at I. iii. 51, 'use' for 'us'd' at III. iii. 73), but others are either dubious in principle or open to objection on other grounds.

Editors have in recent years hesitated to emend a reading which makes sufficient sense even when the compositor alone stands between them and a single authoritative copy. But Dr. Walker's improvements assume not only a scribal or compositorial error but also a collator's oversight. Thus, at III. iii. 147, the plural is dropped from 'monster of ingratitude' with the support of a parallel from Jonson. Whatever the merit of the reading (and the plural does consort better with 'those scraps'), are we free to override the double authority, however tainted, of compositor and collator? One's doubts are quickened when the plural is dropped from 'subjects all to envious and calumniating Time' (III. iii. 173); since a government metaphor would hold here as it does in 2 *Henry IV*, I. iii. 110, 'We are time's subjects'. The more plausible emendation of 'distruction' to 'distraction' (III. ii. 23) is supported by the vulnerable argument that the *F* collator makes two similar corrections elsewhere—why should he not be credited with the same vigilance here? At IV. v. 9 'collick' is found in both texts to express the puffed cheeks of Aquilon. Dr. Walker rejects the usual comparison with Hotspur (1 *Henry IV*, III. i. 28) on grounds of decorum and prints the rare 'choller', meaning 'jaw'. Ought one to postulate both an error and an oversight in order to enlarge Shakespeare's vocabulary and exempt Ajax from vulgarity? Shakespeare is again credited with a new word at III. i. 34, where 'indivisible' displaces 'invisible'; elsewhere Shakespeare uses 'undividable'—the usual sixteenth-century form. What is at issue is not our right to assume errors common to *Q* and *F* (there must be many) but our right to emend in the confidence that we know what they are. We ought not to emend unnecessarily.

Among the manifest common errors that do call for emendation I should count 'embrasures' at IV. iv. 37, but would prefer 'embracements', the usual Shakespearean noun, to 'embraces'.

Dr. Walker's preface is largely a restatement of O. J. Campbell's reading of the play as a satire, and it is marred by the same determination to make the category absolute. Those who find the play a keen but moving exploration of ideals and allegiances vindicated in 'the extant moment' but forfeit to shifts of circumstance and the passage of time, will find her approach severely limited. The sophisticated and satirical bent of the play does not preclude pathos and compassion, and Shakespeare's attitudes cannot be conveyed by the phrases used about them—'Cressida is cheap stuff', 'Priam is ineffective and Troilus is giddy headed'. Nor will the theme respond to an attempt to make the issue between 'blood' and 'reason' a direct and simple one. A failure of precise response is detectable in Dr. Walker's allusion to 'the dignified proposition of the Prologue' when, in the lines she quotes, the epithets 'ransack', 'ravished', and 'wanton', and the terse disclaimer, 'and that's the quarrel', initiate exactly the tension between heroic celebration and satirical astringency which is kept up throughout the play.

Mr. Maxwell, whose introduction to *Timon of Athens* is a model of critical precision, cannot be so faulted. He brings to this difficult text an ear alert for its shifts of key between tragic renunciation and mere truculence. He notices, for example, in 'nothing brings me all things', the suggestion of 'a wisdom of withdrawal to be achieved only in death', and he contrasts 'the more satiric and less mysteriously resonant lines which are appended to Timon's description of his choice of a grave'. He reaches his own conclusions by way of decisive dissent from more extreme positions and his approach to the critics anticipates his approach to the play whose leading contrast he finds 'between an inhuman excess and a balanced humanity'. The individual themes (prodigality, usury, bounty, 'continue goodness') are, he says, 'worked out with passion and brilliance', but the shapely qualities required by the formality of the structure are never quite achieved and the material ultimately proves recalcitrant.

Coleridge thought *Timon* 'an after-vibration of King Lear' but Maxwell is better disposed to Raleigh's view that it came first. Had he elaborated his comparisons not with *Lear* but with the other plays from Plutarch, however, Maxwell's final emphasis might have been different. In *Coriolanus* and *Antony and Cleopatra* Plutarch's hostility to 'excess' is at once eloquently conveyed and sharply challenged. 'The road of excess', one is made to feel, 'leads to the Palace of Wisdom', and 'the fool who persists in his folly will become wise'.

Mr. Maxwell's handling of the text is conservative in comparison with Dr. Walker's, but his treatment of the opening of IV. iii shows the same readiness to 'improve'. Working on a compositorial corruption of a rough draft, he feels free to emend not only the acknowledged corruptions ('senator' for 'Senators', 'wether's' for 'Brothers', 'lean' for 'leau') but also the much more marginal 'deny't', which becomes 'deject'. F might be paraphrased, 'refuse fortune to that lord'. In tidying up the antithesis with 'raise' is Mr. Maxwell correcting the compositor or improving Shakespeare's rough draft? It would be more legitimate



to emend 'oblique' later in the speech to 'obliquitie', keeping the double sense of moral and mechanical deviation at the price of a negligible metrical disturbance. And a case might be made for tampering with F's, 'who dares? who dares'. Arguing a compositorial repetition, we might retain the apostrophe and read, 'Who stirs? who dares'. What is there, apart from an arbitrary conservatism, to restrain us from 'improvements' of this kind? The answer under the new order may well be 'nothing', and it will bring us all sorts of things.

J. P. BROCKBANK

**The First Modern Comedies.** By NORMAN H. HOLLAND. Pp. viii+274. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1959. 45s. net.

It is a pity that Mr. Holland should mar his excellent book on Restoration Comedy by adopting what seems to be the fashion in America of decrying his predecessors in the same field. The arrow sometimes turns out to be a boomerang. Why go on girding at people who find this comedy immoral, since nobody, except, of course, William Archer, has done so since John Palmer published his historic book (the apt adjective is Mr. Holland's) some fifty years ago? It is a mistake on his part to jibe at those who describe this drama as 'clique'. Of course it was. All modern comedy is written for a certain brand of audience about itself—which does not prevent its being of universal application if it is great enough—and he gives his case away when he says that Congreve's masterpiece was a failure because the audience, and its taste, had changed. And if Mr. Holland realized that 'Manners' meant '*mœurs*' he would not be so hard upon those who call it 'The Comedy of Manners', since *mœurs* is exactly what he bids us to understand the work of Etherege, Wycherley, and Congreve is about. His chapter on 'The Critical Failure' suggests, even more than suggests, that he is the only critic to have understood this comedy. Because others understood it a little differently, did they necessarily understand it less well?

Having said this, it only remains to praise this scholarly, perceptive, and stimulating study of the eleven plays of the three outstanding comedy writers between 1660 and 1700. The main thesis is that this comedy was concerned with distinguishing 'appearance' from 'nature', and the 'family' or 'dynastic' feelings from 'emotion', or, as he sums up later, fact from value. It might be thought, perhaps, that the first dichotomy is only another way of putting the idea of 'acquired follies', but Mr. Holland takes it further than that, and makes it more interesting. Etherege might have been a little surprised at learning what he was doing, Wycherley might feel that his deeply puritanical anger was a little left out of account, and Congreve wonder if in *The Way of the World* he was really dealing with the emancipation of society from an old social structure and the erection of a new one. But that does not make Mr. Holland's arguments any less interesting for us. Granted his premisses, for which he argues very persuasively, his analysis of the plays is brilliant. He can even justify what seems to be the needless complexity of the plot of *The Way of the World*, on the ground that Congreve was concerned with *unravelling* and *emancipating*.

Disagree as one may here and there with Mr. Holland, and wonder sometimes whether he is not over-running the scent, there is no doubt that this is a major contribution to the criticism of this particular phase of comedy. His treatment of situations is illuminating, his handling of the implications of simile beautifully sensitive. He traces with a fine realization of the change in philosophic ethos how this comedy developed 'from a mere spoofing of heroic conventions to the more general notion of a separation of appearance and nature'. His final chapter, 'Forms to his Conceit', should be pondered by any future producer of these plays. The work, moreover, is thoroughly well nourished by wide yet relevant reading; there is nothing in the book which is not to the point as he sees it. It must certainly be 'required reading' for any student of Restoration Comedy.

BONAMY DOBRÉE

**English Literature in the Early Eighteenth Century 1700-1740.** By BONAMY DOBRÉE. Pp. xii+702. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1959. 42s. net.

Four volumes of the 'Oxford History of English Literature' appeared within a period of nine years; and now comes a fifth and largest volume, delayed in production by the interception of the Second World War. The plan for the volume is original and helpful, and skilfully introduces lesser writers of the day without impeding the major movement of the narrative. In the decades across which Professor Dobrée's history travels he discusses the emergence of a new middle class, markedly apparent in the appeal of the lesser versifiers. We must, however, exercise caution in pressing home our implications. If Defoe is to be accepted as the pre-eminent prose and verse writer of the period readily understood by a new class, it was as readers engaged in an occupation and not necessarily for instruction. As Mr. Dobrée admirably puts it, Defoe had an 'astounding capacity for living into other people and their experiences, of imagining all the circumstances, so that what he tells has the importunity of truth'. In the same class those of the more genteel, living in more mannered surroundings, found content and pleasure in the essays of the *Tatler* and *Spectator*. Defoe's journalism was directed towards politics and the rising men of commerce, Addison's to the interests and habits of exact households rather than to the atmosphere of the coffee-house.

Mr. Dobrée commands an attractive style; and, further, the background of his narrative is ably presented. He has also succeeded, if at some cost, in ranging minor figures in suitable relationships to the greater names. The three outstanding names in this volume, to whom, as might be expected, major space is assigned, are Defoe, Swift, and Pope. The documentary range is skilfully planned. Nevertheless, a better attendant bibliography towards the latter part of the volume would have been helpful.

The editorial preface, ushering the reader into this large volume, is unexpectedly brief; but, on the whole, serves its purpose with a useful directness. The book, we are told, is written 'for the inquiring student and the interested general reader'. The reader, however, is reminded that in the forty years covered by the

volume much may have changed in the form and manner of the major writers. The allotment of space is worth noting. Defoe and Pope are given two chapters each; and Swift engages an even larger proportion of the book. He occupies a place in an early chapter in company with Defoe, Steele, Addison, and Arbuthnot, and a later chapter as Irish patriot, poet, and author of *Gulliver's Travels*. Indeed Swift can claim something between one-seventh and one-eighth part of the whole volume.

Passing from the social background of the earliest years of the eighteenth century we enter a discussion of the prevalent sentiment of the community under the last of the Stuart sovereigns and the early Hanoverians. The 'age of reason', as these years are so often called, is a fairly justifiable phrase. Locke, who died at the beginning of the century, was constantly quoted. The range of the divine creation was discussed in prose, and later by Pope in verse, in alliance with Christianity and the discoveries cultivated by the Royal Society. Passing to the next chapter, and to Defoe again, we meet with sectarianism, trade, and commerce. Later in the volume, in chapter xi, we have two admirable studies of Defoe's miscellaneous writings and his fiction. For the collector, by the way, original editions of the latter works are not easy to come by.

Thence we return to Swift as a political pamphleteer, as pre-eminent in that character as anyone who has ever entered the field. Macaulay, who had no kindly feelings for Swift, accepted him unquestioningly in this character and attainment, unlike Dr. Johnson who observed of him caustically: 'He had to count ten, and he has counted it right'. In the same character Johnson could not claim as much for himself.

Meanwhile Addison, after placing 'culture' within reach of thousands, and sustaining that position for generations, has faded almost to extinction. Selections from his essays, it is true, have survived in uncertain measure for two centuries; and, unexpectedly, the most thorough biography was published as late as 1954.

Mr. Dobrée's introductory pages, as we move from prose to poetry, are admirably phrased, although this part of the work is somewhat irregularly shaped. The poetic tension of these years, largely permeated by the practical, he characterizes as necessarily low. Speaking broadly, the first twenty years of the century fail to exhibit poetry which provides any depth of emotion. Pope must necessarily be left out when making generalizations of this kind.

As noted, Mr. Dobrée asserts that he keeps in mind the 'general reader'. His brief 'conclusion' rounds off a story covering forty important years. A fair proportion of the verse of this period was written, as he says, 'by men with alert and amused minds'. Two well-known modern anthologies of the age fairly confirm this claim. The work of third-rate poetasters in any age may, in any event, be ignored.

The chronological table, arranged in five columns—date, literary history, verse, prose, drama—is a useful aid to memory. It may be that Mr. Dobrée is not wholly responsible for the hundred pages of bibliography. To cover so large a work completely is not to be expected. Some obvious omissions, especially of later reference works, are noticeable.

HAROLD WILLIAMS

**Daniel Defoe. Citizen of the Modern World.** By J. R. MOORE. Pp. xvi + 410. Chicago: University Press, 1958; London: Cambridge University Press, 1959. 56s. 6d. net.

It is abundantly evident that this book is the result of the labour of a lifetime, and that it was a labour of love. In the first fifteen chapters Professor Moore traces the history of his hero, for whom he provides a rich back-cloth from his times, down to his work as agent for the Union in 1706-7. In the remaining eleven chapters the information is grouped according to particular aspects of Defoe's work, e.g. his travelling and travel stories, his historical interests, economics, the lives of the underprivileged such as Moll Flanders and Colonel Jack. This latter method, indeed, has been adopted also in the earlier chapters when there was enough information, as about Defoe's opinions on bankruptcy, or on military tactics. Mr. Moore is intimately acquainted with all the details of Defoe's life and tends to treat closely studied minor points as major ones, to be fitted into a general framework which is often referred to rather than presented. To compensate for this a very detailed, and sometimes conjectural, 'Chronological Outline' of more than ten pages is provided at the end, together with a large body of notes, mainly of sources. The strength of the book lies in those chapters in which particular situations in Defoe's life or aspects of his work are traced in all their ramifications. A lifetime's readings in Defoe and his contemporaries has enabled Mr. Moore to collect a vast body of useful cross-references. Thus everything Defoe had to say, for example, on the question of settling the Protestant refugees is here brought together (pp. 303-4), Colonel Jack's desire to behave like a gentleman is traced back to a passage in the fictitious *Memoirs of the Count de Rochefort* and found again in *Defoe's Compleat English Gentleman* (pp. 246-7), and in chapter xix the reappearance of earlier scraps of his poetry in his later publications is discussed in detail. One of the longest and fullest chapters in the book is the one on Defoe in the pillory. Much of this information is based on newly discovered documents or on research among a body of writings largely ephemeral, and meant to be so, which few of Mr. Moore's readers and colleagues, if any, can know so well as he does. There is new information, for example, on the spelling of Defoe's name (pp. 7-8), on Defoe's son Benjamin (p. viii, pp. 331-4), on the names of the judges and jurors in Defoe's indictment and trial in 1703 (p. 120), on the Whig agent Edward Bellamy, who had taken the manuscript for *The Shortest Way with the Dissenters* to the printer, and who afterwards betrayed Defoe (pp. 113-14), on the 'clergyman in the country', one Moore, who had prized this pamphlet next to the Bible (p. 110), on the collecting and preparing of the material for his report on the great storm (pp. 150-5), or on a possible connexion between Defoe and Sir Hans Sloane (p. 276). There are occasional references to new additions to the Defoe canon, for example, *The Opinion of a Known Dissenter* (1702) (p. 109). For a full catalogue of Defoe's now 'no less than 545 titles' (p. 356)—which in Professor Dobrée's volume of the *O.H.E.L.* still stand at 'above 400' (p. 634)—we shall, however, have to wait for Mr. Moore's bibliography.

There are some minor blemishes. The references to the *Atlas Maritimus* in the index, for instance, come from the preceding entry. In the notes on chapter

xx the last entry of group 7 belongs to group 8, and in the notes on chapter xxi group 7 has dropped out altogether. Of the illustrations only two are referred to their origins, and the reader is not cautioned that the maps are of a somewhat later date than the one which they serve to illustrate. The reference to the Earl of Orrery (p. 11) should have been to the Earl of Ossory (Lee, ii. 93), and, perhaps, to 1671, 1674 being the year in which Defoe was told about his relative's excursion to Flanders. The purely meretricious and factually impossible identification of the 'Cavalier' with Andrew Newport, Esq., is repeated without a word to say that this was disproved by C. H. Firth's biography of Newport in *D.N.B.* as far back as 1895. It is not a very convincing proof of Defoe's knowledge of foreign countries that Mr. Moore quotes his unfortunate reference to 'the Abruzzo' (*Tour*, ii. 87) as if it were another town in Italy. Sometimes Mr. Moore makes his sources say more than they do say, as when he takes Swift's contemptuous pretence of having forgotten Defoe's name for a statement of fact (p. vii). The praise by an unspecified 'military officer' of Defoe's description of the crossing of the Lech by Gustavus Adolphus is passed on as proof of Defoe's military genius (p. 60), although Sir Walter Scott had shown in 1809 that in this passage *The Memoirs of a Cavalier* depends even in detail on its source. Frequently Mr. Moore bases his statements about details of Defoe's life and work on the additional volumes (1727) of Mist's *Collection of Miscellany Letters* with which Defoe had nothing to do (Lee, i. 349). Nor is the reader informed that the extent of Defoe's share in some titles, for example, *Robert Drury's Journal* and *A General History of the Pirates*, is still a subject of discussion.

Turning from minor to major matters the reader will do well not to overlook the subtitle: it is of Defoe, A Citizen of the Modern World, that Mr. Moore writes, and Defoe the author, the Puritan, or the man is only incidentally referred to. The very short chapter on *Robinson Crusoe* offers just one sentence in the way of literary evaluation: 'In the end it is the imagination that counts most in Robinson Crusoe.' Of *The Family Instructor* far more is said about its printing and its sale than about its contents. In this respect it is interesting to see that Wilson, Lee, Wright, Trent, Dottin, Secord, Sutherland (for points of fact, not for literary appreciation), Newton, Healey, and no fewer than thirty-five of Mr. Moore's own papers are quoted, while it was not once necessary to refer to those scholars who, like Rudolf G. Stamm (1936), John F. Ross (1941), or Bonamy Dobrée (1946, 1949), have investigated, fully and searchingly, the Puritan, the antagonist of Swift, and the prose-writer Defoe. It is a pity that the more specifically literary contributions by A. D. McKillop (1956) and Ian Watt (1957) apparently came too late even for a reference in the 'Foreword'.

Thus the picture which emerges from Mr. Moore's book is one-sided. There is much pleasant and informative reading on Defoe as a journalist and government agent, although even here the wisdom of using 'Modern World' conceptions and terms, such as 'star-reporter' (p. 158), or 'cold war' (p. 211), may appear questionable. In other chapters Mr. Moore's admiration for his hero is less convincing. Like Defoe himself Mr. Moore appears most sanguine in assessing his hero's capabilities. Almost every claim Defoe made is accepted at its face value, in spite of Mr. Moore's own warning 'the *Appeal* must be read cautiously'



(p. 69). In his view Defoe is an expert swordsman (p. 24), a good swimmer (p. 224), an authority on horses and racing (p. 24), on opera (p. 26), on painting (p. 73) and drama (p. 25), a skilled military strategist, unfortunately without opportunity to show his qualities (p. 59), an affectionate parent (p. 65), 'well established as a merchant' in 1683 (p. 83) and an expert accountant (p. 187), a specialist in the affairs of Scotland, 'actually the closest tie between the two nations' (p. 176), 'in complete harmony' with King William (p. 77) and, of course, his 'secret adviser' (p. 286). Small wonder that Minto appears as the prototype of an 'unfriendly critic' (p. 72), and that Defoe is compared to Rembrandt, Milton, and Bach, for combining morals with art, and to Christ on the Cross for standing in the pillory (p. 104, cf. also p. vii).

Altogether a book to make the reviewer unhappy. It is not so much a book on Defoe as an indispensable appendix to all earlier and many future ones. No student of Defoe and his time can afford to disregard the wealth of information here offered, although he will do well to check carefully what he wants to use. Very few readers will be completely satisfied with the picture it presents of this remarkable personality, who was in fact truly versatile and energetic, sanguinic and possessed, not always lovable, constantly suffering under real and imaginary persecutions, an author whose literary productions include, half by chance, one of the world's few everlasting visions, and whose works as a whole, again half by chance, stand at the beginning of a peculiar kind of literature which has lasted until our own day and shows no signs of weakening yet. FRITZ WÖLCKEN

**Poems of Jonathan Swift.** Edited by JOSEPH HORRELL. Vol. I, pp. lxvi+402; Vol. II, pp. xii+403-818 (The Muses' Library). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1958. 42s. net.

**Poems of Charles Cotton.** Edited by JOHN BUXTON. Pp. xlv+286 (The Muses' Library). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1958. 18s. net.

When Sir Harold Williams published his definitive edition of the poems of Swift in 1937 his establishment of the canon was universally praised, but some reviewers, George Sherburn among them, doubted whether his was the best text for the general reader and whether he had not favoured early versions of the poems (such as the broadside version of 'The Place of the Damn'd' which Swift said was a stolen copy) over those of the Faulkner edition, which Swift presumably approved. Mr. Horrell has adopted the Williams canon with a few exceptions, but bases his text on the eight-volume set of the *Works*, published by Faulkner in 1746. He draws on other collections, single issues, and manuscripts only as necessary. A useful feature is the placing after each poem of its date of composition and of first publication. Blanks are usually filled out. In 'Cadenus and Vanessa' (p. 103) three of the six passages printed in the 1726 editions and omitted by Swift in the *Miscellanies* of 1727 and in Faulkner 1735 are put back in place within the body of the poem, within square brackets. The epistle 'To a Lady' (p. 675), based as it is on Faulkner, includes the additional lines he introduced, which Williams, though relegating them to the notes, thought came from an authentic source. Mr. Horrell tells us that Williams believes the poem

to have been begun at Market Hill in 1730, then laid aside and completed early in 1733 'with the lines beginning at 133'. This is not a reference to l. 133 in his own text, but in Williams's; the new lines begin at l. 141 in his own edition. On 'Stella at Wood-Park' (p. 149) he mentions that the poem is made up of two draft poems, but does not point out as Williams does that crude dovetailing is responsible for the grammatical awkwardness of ll. 21-23 or that 'malice' (l. 24) is a mistake for 'med'cine' and 'lodgings' (l. 60) for 'Houses'. Using the 1746 Faulkner edition, supplemented from a copy of the first Dublin edition, 1739, with annotations in a contemporary hand, he gives a composite version of the 'Verses on the Death of Dr. Swift' which is substantially the same as that arrived at by Williams. 'Poems from the "Holyhead Journal"' are printed from Craik's *Life of Swift*, not from the manuscript at South Kensington. So ll. 3 and 4 are not transposed to follow l. 6, and l. 59 of 'Ireland' retains the reading 'To bring up all who smuggle wool' where Williams reads 'hang' for 'bring'. Hawkesworth's disjointed text of 'Scriblerian Verses' has been rearranged in the order given by Ball, although, as Williams says, 'An Answer', attributed by Hawkesworth to Gay, is clearly written by Oxford. It is hard to see why Mr. Horrell does not print the early version of 'Baucis and Philemon'. The lack of it is a serious loss. Another curious omission is 'Twelve Articles', the poem which normally has been published as an appendage to 'Daphne', though in Faulkner the two poems were separated. The proof-reading and checking of the volumes in the Muses' Library series are not always what they ought to be, and it may be that because of the separation in Faulkner 'Twelve Articles' has been lost in Mr. Horrell's edition by inadvertence.

Several slips and misprints may be noticed, the worst being 'King' for 'kind' in the 'Day of Judgement', l. 11 (p. 97). The date of first publication of this poem is also given as 1744 instead of 1774. There are other misprints on p. 611, l. 56; p. 724, l. 133; p. 733, l. 377. Two pieces are not in the first-line index, 'An Answer, by Delaney', p. 298, and 'Postscript', p. 283. 'Pray disruciate what follows' is not a first line but an introductory remark.

Mr. Horrell's edition is not without blemishes but in the main it provides a reliable text for the general reader, in a neat and serviceable format. The bulk might have been reduced by the omission of the 'Trifles', which are tedious enough, but they show a not unimportant side of Swift as an author.

In contrast, Charles Cotton's work is decidedly 'poetry of the milder muse', as Coleridge considered it approvingly in a passage from the *Biographia Literaria* which Mr. Buxton quotes. Easygoing, good-natured, spendthrift, a lover of women and the countryside and of convivial good fellowship, Cotton seems everything that Swift was not. His poetry has none of Swift's fierce intellectual force, or his extravagance of imagination in tension with his concentrated economy of means—and none of his congested disgust. Mr. Buxton has drawn on a manuscript of Cotton's poems in Derby Borough Library, which shows improved readings in many instances over the careless edition of 1689. 'The Wonders of the Peake' has been included. The selection has been made to be characteristic of the author and the poems leave as pleasant an impression of him as their editor intended.

HANNAH BUCHAN

**Mountain Gloom and Mountain Glory. The Development of the Aesthetics of the Infinite.** By MARJORIE HOPE NICOLSON. Pp. xviii+404. Ithaca: Cornell University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1959. 48s. net.

Mountains were a favourite theme of Romantic art. They bulk large in the poetry of Wordsworth, Byron, and Shelley; yet until the eighteenth century few were found to admire them. Professor Nicolson sets herself the problem, 'Why did mountain attitudes change so spectacularly in England?' and solves it by exploring once more the relationship between science and literature in the seventeenth century. Before the Renaissance mountains had been symbols of pride, reminders of the Fall, at best inconveniences. But the new philosophers were exhilarated by the apparently infinite universe which telescope and microscope revealed to them, and their exhilaration came to embrace all physical evidences of God's power—including mountains. Though Thomas Burnet repeats the old objections to mountains in his *Sacred Theory of the Earth* (1681), his writing betrays that he has been deeply impressed by his experience of the Alps. His book began a controversy which stimulated both geologists and critics. Dennis, Shaftesbury, and Addison were made aware, not only of the 'rhetorical', but of the 'natural' sublime; and a century of descriptive poetry followed, during which the mountains came into their own. It was this tradition which the Romantics inherited.

Miss Nicolson usefully reminds us of a period when there were not yet 'two cultures', and of the impassioned expression in the countenance of its science. (Evidence is understandably taken from the prose of Henry More rather than from that of Locke or Sprat.) As an answer to her main question the book is less successful, largely because it seldom leaves the plane of intellectual discussion. Like some other American historiographers she sees ideas against a background of ideas, which sometimes gives her arguments an unreal quality. Thus she is more concerned with theoretical developments, which made men more articulate and discriminating in their response to mountains, than with the response itself. Indeed, she states flatly that 'what men see in Nature is the result of what they have been taught to see' (p. 3); thus 'conditioning' is the all-important process. Burnet's case might seem to prove otherwise, since his experience contradicted his preconceptions, and Miss Nicolson does refer (once) to his 'native' enthusiasm for mountains (p. 221). But even this enthusiasm was the product of conditioning: Burnet's 'aesthetic feelings' were 'born of the new philosophy', and his successors 'read into mountains emotions once reserved for God and then . . . transferred to inter-stellar space' (p. 224). Surely this approach gives too much importance to conditioning and not enough to the personal experience which is conditioned. Would Wordsworth's early feeling for mountains have been very different if Burnet had never written?

Moreover, the conditioning Miss Nicolson describes is almost wholly intellectual, whereas interest in mountains was encouraged by social facts as well as by scientific ideas. When all qualifications have been made the eighteenth century still seems a period of order and security, during which it seemed increasingly agreeable to taste mystery, gloom, and terror—in graveyard poems, in Gothic romances, and in descriptions of wild scenery (much used by Mrs. Radcliffe).

By the nineteenth century men had new inducements to escape into the hills, as Wordsworth's protest against the Kendal and Windermere Railway shows. Miss Nicolson may be excused for not re-examining these and other non-intellectual causes of the shift in taste, but she should have been able to remind the student of their existence. Again, a more complete answer to her original question would have taken account of parallel literary developments, such as the cult of the picturesque.

Finally, Miss Nicolson sometimes coerces material into her system; this occurs most often in Chapter I, in which she demonstrates the early contempt for mountains. We may grant that mountains were not yet in vogue without supposing them universally detested. Whatever Luther thought of mountains, the quotation on p. 102 does not show that he placed them below fountains and rivers, which had existed in Eden. When Evelyn compares the Alps rising from the Lombardy plain to piles of rubbish swept from a level floor (p. 62), and when Hobbes likens a cloven hill to a pair of upraised buttocks (p. 65), they are not concerned to express disgust but to convey, in as striking a way as possible, the exact shape of the thing described. Similarly, when James Howell writes that the Welsh hills are to the Pyrenees as pimples to warts (p. 96) he is interested chiefly in their relative sizes; he also writes that they are as pygmies to giants. Elsewhere Howell refers disparagingly to 'bleak barren hills', as to heaths and commons, but here he is comparing English with French agriculture. And a piece of poetic rhetoric by Marvell should not be seriously cited (as it frequently is here) in proof of his 'condemnation of mountains'. Here the same over-intellectualization seems at work: Marvell's 'conditioning' is felt to be more important than his common sense. But it will not be supposed that this is the kind of work in which quotations are forced into a pattern by the pressure of insensitive verbalizing. Miss Nicolson has a genuine case and states it with clarity and intelligence; and if her account of 'mountain attitudes' is incomplete, it is also genuinely illuminating.

DEREK ROPER

**The Letters of John Keats 1814-1821.** Edited by HYDER EDWARD ROLLINS. Vol. I, pp. xxii+442; Vol. II, pp. xiv+440. Cambridge: University Press, 1958. £7 net.

These volumes constitute Professor Hyder Rollins's last tribute of scholarship to John Keats. The prefatory note which he wrote at the end of his task is dated about seven months before his death. The text, printed at the Plimpton Press in Massachusetts, is in the most elegant tradition of American academic book production, and nothing is neglected in the apparatus: a detailed list of events in Keats's life, biographies of those with whom he corresponded or who were in his circle all supplement full notes to the letters themselves. There is further a note on the principles on which this diplomatic text has been produced. Rollins has been faithful even to indicating Keats's misspellings, the most interesting of

which is found in his great difficulty in writing, and Rollins supposes in pronouncing, 'r': 'So on page after page there are such misspellings as "affod," "depreciate," "expession," "gieved," "peach," "poof," "procue," "shot," "surpised," "aping," "thead," "thee," "witten," "wost."'

What, it will be asked, is gained by this edition in comparison with *The Letters of John Keats* (1931; 4th edn. 1952) by Maurice Buxton Forman? To his predecessors Rollins is generous. He emphasizes Forman's zeal as a collector, and notes that 'several of the letters to Fanny Brawne are now known only through his texts'. Further, he pays tribute to Forman's editing: his texts were, 'with few exceptions, exactly what Keats wrote'. There may be missed any full appreciation of the skill and pertinacity in collecting which Forman had inherited from his father. To quote only one example, it was Forman who first published Keats's letter to his sister before her confirmation, which reflects a new aspect of his character and far more knowledge of the Christian faith and its rituals than could have been gathered from any other of his writings.

This edition has no new material of a similar exciting importance. All Rollins can claim is that 'the present work includes seven letters or other documents signed or written by Keats that appear in no English edition'. It would have been helpful if at this place a page reference had been given to these seven new items. Further, these items are not necessarily new to those interested in Keats. Presumably they include the letter to Joseph Severn of 1 November 1816 which is now in the Houghton Library, knowledge of which appeared too late for its inclusion in Forman's edition of 1952. But as Rollins has noted, it was printed, with a very full discussion, by M. C. Bates in the *Keats-Shelley Journal*, iii (1954), 75-83.

In addition Rollins prints new texts of seven other letters written by Keats. Fortunately these are listed in the introduction. One of them, for instance, is the famous letter to J. H. Reynolds of 19 February 1818 on 'Indolence' ('I have an idea that a Man might pass a very pleasant life in this manner'). This letter exists in the Woodhouse transcript and in the original manuscript, which, as Rollins writes, is now in the possession of 'Robert H. Taylor, Yonkers, New York (formerly owned by A. S. W. Rosenbach)'. From his general statement it could be surmised, though probably this is not his intention, that all previous editors had used the Woodhouse transcript and that the letter was now printed from the manuscript for the first time. Woodhouse was a careful transcriber and made few errors, but in the sonnet that is quoted in the letter he wrote, 'O thou whose only book hath been the light', where the manuscript reads 'has'. Again in the text of the letter where the manuscript reads 'now I am sensible all this is a mere sophistication, however it may neighbour to any truths, to excuse my own indolence', Woodhouse read 'indulgence'. But Forman has the reading of the manuscript in both these instances and, indeed, he gives as the sources of his text a transcript made by Rosenbach especially for him. The only variations are those of punctuation and a few minor verbal changes which affect no point of substance.

Rollins has produced a diplomatic edition, and has redated and rearranged about sixty of the letters. The Woodhouse transcripts and the Jeffrey transcripts



are now available and Rollins was able to print them 'for the first time exactly as Woodhouse and Jeffrey copied them'.

All these tasks have been meticulously conducted, but one may doubt whether it can be justly said that textually 'this edition, then, will be found to have comparatively little resemblance to any of its predecessors'. No biographer or critic of Keats will have to change any view previously held from any new findings in these texts. All this is not to minimize the importance of this edition. Rollins has provided a far more ample background of letters addressed to Keats and of other relevant documents than did Forman. His notes are full and detailed, perhaps at times too full. For instance, in Keats's letter to J. H. Reynolds of 19 February 1818, Keats writes 'when Man has arrived at a certain ripeness in intellect any one grand and spiritual passage serves him as a starting post towards all "the two-and thirty Pallaces"'. Forman gives a note here referring to the "palaces of delight" of the Buddhist doctrine'. This admittedly is a very incomplete reference and there is no indication where Keats had come upon this in his reading. Rollins has a note that 'Keats could hardly have known anything about Buddhism (as has been suggested) or about the Medieval Indian story-book, *Vikrama's Adventures*, in which thirty-two stories about King Vikrama are told by the thirty-two statuettes that supported his throne'. This still leaves 'the two-and thirty Pallaces' unexplained, nor are we informed why Keats could not in his very ample reading have fallen upon some account of Buddhism which contained the necessary reference.

Rollins does not attempt a fresh assessment of the importance of the letters, nor would one expect this in an edition of this kind. He gives an interesting account of their reputation and notes that James Freeman Clarke, 'a well-known Boston and Louisville divine, was permitted to see some of the letters in the hands of George Keats' and commented that from the specimens he had seen the letters appeared to be 'of a higher order of composition than his poems. There is in them a depth and grasp of thought; a logical accuracy of expression; a fullness of intellectual power, and an earnest struggling after truth, which remind us of the prose of Burns.' This is an extraordinarily perceptive judgement to have come so early, and, as so much of Keats's mind went into his letters, we are fortunate that his life fell upon a period when letter-writing was a social and intellectual practice.

IFOR EVANS

**Coleridge. Critic of Society.** By JOHN COLMER. Pp. xiv+230. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959. 30s. net.

Dr. Colmer hopes that his book 'will fill a gap in Coleridge studies and that it will reveal to the general reader an unexpected side of the poet's mind'. In the first of these hopes he is justified: there is a mass of useful information in his first five chapters, which summarize and analyse printed works difficult of access except in the largest libraries, and which draw also on unpublished manuscript material in the British Museum. Appendix C reprints various articles

from *The Morning Post* of 1799-1802 which were not assigned to Coleridge in his daughter's edition of *Essays on his own Times*, and thus provides a convenient anthology of some of the best of the political journalism; Appendix A summarizes the arguments for Coleridge's authorship of these essays which have been advanced by Mrs. Glickfield, Dr. Erdman, and Dr. Colmer himself.

The expositions are generally of the form: occasion; substance; evaluation; and within this formula Dr. Colmer is a safe guide through such difficulties as the revisions of the Bristol lectures of 1795 (pp. 10-14), the muddled arrangement of *The Friend* of 1809-10 (pp. 87-121; but more consistent cross-referencing between this version and later editions based on the remodelling of 1818 might have been useful), and the tortuous arguments of the *Lay Sermons* and *Church and State* (chap. v). If these expository chapters seem at first reading to be mainly a careful unravelling and summarizing of Coleridge's theories, the usefulness of Dr. Colmer's procedure is clear in that it provides a firm basis for his concluding chapter. Here he draws together his scattered critical comments into a shrewd evaluative essay which finds that 'The intrinsic value of [Coleridge's] political thought is undeniably great', but that various obstacles stood in the way of adequate communication between author and audience. His audience was, indeed, in Dr. Colmer's view, not wholly adequate to the reception of Coleridge's wisdom; moreover, the treatment is too 'broad and inclusive' (p. 172), each work demanding, in some sense, familiarity with the formidable totality of Coleridge's philosophy; and the style, with rare exceptions such as that of the essays in *The Morning Post*, is not adapted to the audience. Considering this failure of communication, and the marked absence of practical proposals for political action against specific evils, we need not be surprised that the politicians of the nineteenth century ignored him.

This is a valid and valuable assessment. Whether it will draw the 'general reader' mentioned in the preface to the study of Coleridge's political writings, even when they become freely accessible, is more debatable. To the more practised reader, Dr. Colmer's findings will not seem quite so unfamiliar as the preface implies. A certain amount of the territory was covered in Waldemar Wünnche, *Die Staatsauffassung Samuel Taylor Coleridges (Palaestra* 190; Leipzig, 1934), of which Dr. Colmer seems unaware. More important, such a reader may find grounds for complaint in that Dr. Colmer is not much concerned to explore two relevant relationships: between the political and other works by Coleridge, and between Coleridge's political writings and those of others. The first of these ensures that the reader who makes any serious attempt to master Coleridge's theories of literature (the commonest avenue of approach) will share Dr. Colmer's ground. For, even if he ignores the writings of 1795-1802, he will be led almost certainly to *The Friend*, the *Lay Sermons*, and *Church and State*; because, as Dr. Colmer rightly observes, 'the worlds of literature and politics interpenetrate in Coleridge's works' (p. 178), or, more simply, because of Coleridge's habit of repeating himself. The analogy cited between Napoleon and Milton's Satan, for instance, appears in *The Statesman's Manual*, Appendix B, as well as in literary lectures. A passage on 'the union of old and new' in literary genius can be traced from a notebook of 1803 through the fifth *Friend* and *The*

*Statesman's Manual* up to *Biographia Literaria*. The second relationship is with Wordsworth in 1808-10. For instance, the distinctions between the voice of the people as inspired by deity and by demon, between talent and genius, and between persons and things, can all be found in Wordsworth's *Convention of Cintra*;<sup>1</sup> and here, too, is a characterization of Napoleon as the amoral man which closely resembles the Coleridgean identification of him with Satan.<sup>2</sup> Coleridge discussed such a figure, with Miltonic quotation, in the sixth *Friend*, whence Wordsworth drew material for a similar discussion in the third *Essay upon Epitaphs*, which itself repeats the drift of an earlier passage in *Cintra*.<sup>3</sup> A phrase from Fulke Greville's biography of Sidney used in *Cintra* reappears in *The Friend*; and a passage from *The Friend* on 'the first duty of a wise advocate' echoes, or is echoed by, Wordsworth's reply to 'Mathetes'.<sup>4</sup> Since Coleridge contributed to *Cintra* and Wordsworth to *The Friend*, such coincidences are not unexpected; but the problem of origination which naturally arises is here as obscure as in the case of *Lyrical Ballads*. Of these matters Dr. Colmer says little; and in this omission may be seen a tendency, against which Coleridge's 'broad and inclusive' treatment might have warned him, to discuss the political writings in a somewhat unreal isolation. Yet all studies, and especially studies of Coleridge, must have limits; and the positive virtues of this book remain considerable.

W. J. B. OWEN

**Novelists on the Novel.** By MIRIAM ALLOTT. Pp. xvi+336. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1959. 30s. net.

**The Theory of the Novel in England 1850-1870.** By RICHARD STANG. Pp. xii+252. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1959. 32s. net.

Both these books make important contributions to the criticism of the novel, especially through the material they present, which overlaps in a particularly interesting field—the observations, formal and informal, offered by the great Victorian novelists on the intentions and methods of their art. The two studies supplement each other by providing different contexts, both illuminating, for these observations. In Mrs. Allott's book they are set alongside those of novelists of other periods and nationalities—and as she says, 'their general agreement on essential issues is striking'; in Mr. Stang's, alongside the critical arguments that were going on so vigorously in contemporary periodicals. Such arguments, for example, were in Mr. Stang's period much concerned with 'the relation of novels to life' (to borrow the characteristically downright title of Fitzjames Stephen's 'Cambridge Essay' of 1855); and in the most substantial and stimulating section of his book, Part III, 'Mid-Victorian Realism', he shows some of the directions they took. This is also the main theme of Mrs. Allott's Part I; and if the plan of her 'anthology' precludes Fitzjames Stephen, it takes in his niece Virginia Woolf.

<sup>1</sup> Colmer, pp. 24-25; 62 ff.; 100, 141; Wordsworth, *Prose Works*, ed. Knight (London, 1896), i. 145, 205; 157-8; 260.

<sup>2</sup> Knight, i. 237-8.

<sup>3</sup> Knight, ii. 171-2; i. 201.

<sup>4</sup> Knight, i. 159; *The Friend* (1818), ii. 12; Knight, i. 102-3; Colmer, p. 44.

More widely selected quotation, illustrating the novelists' practice and the views of critics, is included in her three introductory essays, so that all in all, her book covers more ground, and is at the same time better shaped. Her own point of view is largely implicit, but indicated early on by a statement with a familiar ring: 'it is only with *Middlemarch* (1872) that the English novel begins to stand comparison with French and Russian fiction'. But her general method is self-effacing, the extracts occupying two-thirds of the space; and it would be easy to overlook the skill and sense of purpose that have gone to their selection and ordering. Her book is evidently the result of long and thoughtful reading, and doubtless also of teaching; it should be a valuable guide to the reading and teaching of others who are not so far advanced towards 'a working aesthetic of the novel'. The only danger is that they may use her book as if it provided a more complete account of the subject than it claims to do, instead of seeking, as she would surely wish, to supplement and expand it yet further—for example, by extracts from Bulwer, Mrs. Gaskell, Kingsley, Reade, Howells, and William De Morgan, to instance some unfashionable but not irrelevant names.

Mr. Stang's book contains more unfamiliar material, though this is exaggerated almost absurdly in the introduction, which suggests (unlike his references) that he is the first that ever burst into the silent sea of mid-Victorian periodical criticism. He even claims that the discussions of the novel by Lewes, Bagehot, Hutton, Leslie Stephen, and George Eliot are 'still unknown'. This is also untrue of the general mass of periodicals, which have been productively worked over in studies both of single journals and of the contemporary reception of single authors; and in fact his instances of other scholars' dismissal or disregard of this body of criticism are neither representative nor recent (his bibliography does not include articles later than 1956). But he is the first to make an extended study of this particular subject, and it would be difficult to overrate the interest of the material here represented by constant quotation. While concentrating mainly on the two decades of his title, he looks back to the thirties especially for Bulwer, as well as forward to the seventies in order to follow the continued activity of Hutton, Leslie Stephen, and George Eliot. The year 1838 is interestingly suggested as 'one of the most decisive'; Dickens had emerged, Lockhart's *Life of Scott* was just published and was reviewed by Carlyle, and Bulwer's 'Art of Fiction' appeared in the *Monthly Chronicle*—not as stated on p. 11, in the *Monthly Review*. (Also interesting is an article in Mill's *London Review* of 1835, signed 'B.', pleading for 'rules' for the analysis of prose fiction especially as regards its moral effects, and attempting not very successfully to supply them.) By the forties there is far more material, in review-articles on the new novelists; but certainly the fifties and sixties, so prolific both of periodicals and of animated and responsible critics, are the golden age. The big critical questions were still felt to be open, and worth discussing—as seldom in modern critical journals, so few and slender in comparison. For these two decades, many periodicals could be added even to the ample twenty-four of Mr. Stang's bibliography and others occasionally used in the text; he does not, for instance, draw on many specifically 'religious' periodicals, and there is more free play of mind on the novel than might be expected in the *Christian Remembrancer* and the

*Guardian*; one misses also, from the sixties, the *Contemporary* and the short-lived but impressive *Reader*. Since all the major novelists' own letters, prefaces, 'digressions' in novels, and sometimes editorial advice, continue through this period as an equally rich source of material, Mr. Stang's problem of selection, organization, and emphasis is formidable, and is not always satisfactorily solved. His preference of an arrangement partly under topics and partly under authors instead of chronological (in contrast to Mrs. Allott, who arranges her extracts within each subsection in order of date) is defensible, and works quite well where a topic is capable of being isolated, like 'The Disappearing Author', and through most of the section on 'realism', not so well in the opening section on 'The Sacred Office'. Here a freer use of incidental dates in footnotes and text would have helped; even in the bibliography, 'Section 3b, Primary Material, Books 1850-1870' no dates for the original publication of any novels are given, but merely such autobiographical and rather unprofessional entries as 'Brontë, Charlotte. Novels, Everyman's Library'.

But what the whole subject really needed was simply more space, and more time. Mr. Stang must be in a position to assess the total contribution of most of his major critics, but he has no room to do this, nor to indicate developments and differences within his period. (One misses this particularly in the final section, 'The Cheek of the Young Person'.) And the attitude of the novelists is sometimes too hastily interpreted—Scott's, on pp. 7-8 and p. 45, George Eliot's on p. 147, and Thackeray's frequently, for his tone, especially in his letters where the occasion colours it, demands a very sensitive ear. It is misleading to emphasize the attacks on Mrs. Gaskell's earlier novels (p. 217) when so many reviews, notably of *Ruth*, were favourable, and one or two critics even thought her not bold enough.

All such complaints, however, must be understood as a tribute to the material itself, and to Mr. Stang for making so much of it readily accessible. His book will be much used, and deserves to be. This being so, it seems worth while to supplement and adjust some attributions of anonymous periodical articles. Three important review-articles on novels in *Bentley's Quarterly* of 1859-60 are by Anne Mozley; she collected the one on *Adam Bede* along with her *Blackwood's* essays, and her authorship of the others is known from Bentley's *List of Publications*. The same source suggests that the author of the 1859 essay in *Bentley's Miscellany* may be W. F. Ainsworth, cousin of the novelist. F. T. Palgrave wrote the Thackeray article in the *Westminster* (1860), Henry Hill Lancaster the George Eliot article in the *North British* (1866) and also the Thackeray obituary article, jointly with Dr. John Brown. The *National* George Eliot article (1860) is not by Bagehot but by Hutton, who collected it in revised form. Mansel's posthumously collected *Letters, Lectures, and Reviews* (1873) include the *Quarterly* article on 'Sensation Novels' (1863), here attributed to Mrs. Oliphant. The *Westminster's* review of Hawthorne's *Blithedale Romance* is unlikely to be by George Eliot, as it contradicts her known views; and evidence for Bagehot's authorship of 'A Novel or Two' (*National*, 1855) is very weak. The George Sand article, here also given to Bagehot, has been recently discovered by Dr. R. H. Tener (from an unpublished letter in the Porch collection) to be by



Sandars, probably T. C. Sandars, a writer for the *Saturday Review*. (Dr. Tener also kindly allows me to add his considered opinion that Hutton was not the author of four *Spectator* articles here attributed to him, namely '*Lost Sir Massingberd*', '*The Moonstone*', '*Sensation Novels*', and '*The Empire of the Novel*'.)

Minor errors over names are rather numerous; many, such as 'Deborah Jenkynson', 'Sidney Smith', 'K. G. Kitton', '*Sanford and Merton*', '*Richard Fernal*', 'Gwendolyn' (*Daniel Deronda*), Barnes Newcome's wife 'Clare', Thackeray's '*British Humourists*', may have been merely overlooked in proof, but William Rathbone Greg's name is misspelt 'Gregg' on all its five appearances. On p. 39 Tom Thurnall and Elsley Vavasour in *Two Years Ago* are confused, which makes nonsense of Meredith's review.

KATHLEEN TILLOTSON

**The Novels of George Eliot.** By JEROME THALE. Pp. xii+176. New York: Columbia University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1959. 30s. net.

Mr. Thale devotes one essay to each of George Eliot's novels, dealing only with 'what seems to [him] central to the novel at hand' (1. The Basis of Conduct: *Adam Bede*; 2. The Social View: *The Mill on the Floss*; 3. George Eliot's Fable for her Times: *Silas Marner*; 4. The Uses of Failure: *Romola*; 5. The Politics of Self-knowledge: *Felix Holt*; 6. The Paradox of Individualism: *Middlemarch*; 7. The Darkened World: *Daniel Deronda*). In his concluding chapter he tries to indicate the specific quality of her vision.

Readers may not always agree with Mr. Thale as to what is 'central' in each novel, but there is no doubt that he focuses attention on important aspects of George Eliot's works. His essays are unpretentious and he argues his points clearly. Perhaps he is a little too eager to show that this Victorian novelist can measure with the moderns, though he admits that 'the gains have been made at the expense of other qualities'. He believes that George Eliot belongs to the central tradition of the English novel (as defined by F. R. Leavis and, more recently, by Richard Chase), that her development is towards decreasing intellectuality, and that her chief strength is her intelligence or 'vigor of mind': her main concern is with the process that leads up to the moral choice and consequently her 'method tends towards art as understanding'. He demonstrates that her handling of point of view (notably in the case of Maggie and of Dorothea) is more subtle than has often been recognized. In his last chapter he discusses her style and rightly stresses that, though she makes use of irony and symbolic imagery, her characteristic style is direct statement: her images 'reinforce and lend emotional values to other kinds of meanings', but they are nowhere 'the chief means of communicating or the secret key to the novel'.

In his protest against 'the old-fashioned praise of [*Adam Bede*] as pastoral', Mr. Thale tends perhaps to underestimate the positive qualities of the rural community. True, Christianity in Hayslope needs leavening, but it is surely an exaggeration to call it bankrupt because the rituals are more important to the villagers, and to the Rev. Mr. Irwine, than the doctrine. Hetty's 'alienation' is

alienation from this ordered community, and her 'sin' is closely related to her failure to live up to the standards of her aunt. Arthur's ethics may be inadequate, but even this unsatisfactory code would prevent him from seducing Hetty were it not for his self-delusion. This process of deception rather than the inadequacy of his ethics is given prominence in the searching analysis of the grounds of conduct. George Eliot's point of view is perhaps more narrowly moralistic than Mr. Thale would like to admit; but if, as he says, almost apologetically, we are 'to take the Victorians as they are and for what they are', we had better not ignore this aspect of her art. To view Hetty's alienation in terms of Kafka (p. 33) only confuses the issues.

Mr. Thale's many references to twentieth-century writers suggest not only that he expects his readers to be more familiar with them than with the Victorians, but that these are likely to be more acceptable if they can be shown to be 'disenchanted'. No doubt George Eliot was too keenly aware of the suffering at the heart of the world ever to have shared the brash optimism of some Victorians. But Mr. Thale believes that in *Silas Marner* she showed that if the world is 'tolerable for a great many people', it is 'miserable for some'. It may be hard to reconcile the legendary tale of Silas with the more realistic treatment of the Godfrey story; yet neither, it seems to me, deals with the nature of the world as such. In her first three novels, George Eliot shows men coming to harm through their own or other men's mistakes, limitations, or failure to understand. Only in *Romola* does she present evil as inherent in reality; one is the more surprised, therefore, that Mr. Thale should fail to note the new dimension given to this novel by the political context. He recognizes in it 'a deeper and larger moral vision', but he does not see that *Romola*'s 'splendid isolation' is part of the theme, nor that the tragic core of the novel lies just in the 'cleavage between the world and the operation of the ego', which he considers as one of the main shortcomings. The recognition that evil is real appears most explicitly in the Gwendolen part of *Daniel Deronda*, and Mr. Thale's essay on this novel is probably the best in the book.

IRÈNE SIMON

**The Ethical Idealism of Matthew Arnold.** By WILLIAM ROBBINS. Pp. xii+260. London: Heinemann, 1959. 25s. net.

It might have been better conveyed in the title that this is a study of Arnold's writings on religion, centred in the three late books. As such, it is by far the most important work on an aspect of Arnold which has understandably gained small favour whether from professed theologians or from the uncommitted intelligentsia by whom he preferred to be judged. It can scarcely be laid to the book's charge that it should have failed to render this other Arnold more palatable. So rigorous an inquiry was bound to expose the ultimate irreconcilables in his thinking, as well as to make a reviewer who was on the watch to trace correlatives elsewhere in Arnold, especially in the poetry, aware more than ever of Arnold's progressive

hebraization. Yet it is a principal merit of the book to have gone farther than any other writing on the subject to justify his religious position, without betraying any sign of apology or sectarianism.

The opening chapters give a general exposition of Arnold's religious ideas and the major formative influences behind them. The basis is an ethical pragmatism which, scorning supernatural sanctions, nevertheless looks to a historic church 'freed from its sacerdotal despotism and freed from its pseudo-scientific apparatus of superannuated dogma' (quotation from Arnold, p. 30). The compromise is an uneasy one, as the course of Anglican 'modernism' would itself seem to suggest. Crossfire came from the churches, from teachers of logic and metaphysics, and from humanist rationalism generally; but the ethical teaching contained in Arnold's Christian and Pauline interpretations remains a thing of high value. The chapter on formative influences assesses the contribution of a dozen writers, all from post-Renaissance Europe and nearly all from the generation or two preceding Arnold's. Most noticeable is the magnitude of the debt to Spinoza, who gets eleven paragraphs to the others' one or two each—seemingly a wild disproportion, but found to be largely validated in later chapters. The central chapters, iv–vii, deal with specific issues: Experience and Dogma, the Idea of God, 'Morality touched with Emotion', Church and Dissent. The close analyses involve a good deal of theology and metaphysics, and the reading is anyway not easy; Arnold himself makes considerably easier and (it must be said) more connective reading, but he had invited a specialized commentary such as not many are qualified to give. It was something of a surprise to find him stand up to it so well, in view of his modest demeanour as a presumed amateur in these fields. Chapter viii, A Summary of Arnold's Position, maintains the even balance of sympathetic exposition and reasoned criticism that is a marked feature of the book as a whole. The final chapter briefly surveys the present-day turmoil of religious and secular attitudes, and concludes that in an age like ours 'the sanity and catholicity of attitudes like [Arnold's] are desperately needed'. It can hardly be denied. Nevertheless, the spectacle of a first-class poet turned theologian is not one which all of us can relish, whatever premonitory rumblings of the latter may be audible in the former. Incidentally, Professor Robbins's probe of the poems for the light they shed on Arnold's religious needs supplies half a dozen pages as searching as any in the book (pp. 94–99).

J. P. CURGENVEN

**Conrad the Novelist.** By ALBERT J. GUERARD. Pp. xviii + 322. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1958. 30s. net.

Professor Guerard's book is at once able, rewarding, intelligent, and perverse. It tells us a good deal about Conrad's novels, often on an unusually high level of perception and analysis, and it tells us perhaps even more about why people like Mr. Guerard are keen on Conrad. One might almost say that we have here two books for the price of one.

The first book, though one may not agree with all its implications, is very good.

The isolating of the persistent conflicts and contradictions within Conrad's work is convincing and the biographical link-ups, though one or two now need to be modified in the light of Mr. Baines's biography, strengthen the argument. And the discussion of particular novels is nearly always illuminating, for the strength of Mr. Guerard as literary critic is quite simply that he is a literary critic, sensitive to the texture and the structure of the books he writes about.

The perversities are themselves interesting. I think it is perverse, for instance, to see *Heart of Darkness* as primarily about Marlow 'and his journey toward or through certain facets or potentiality of self'. The playing-down of the objective, as opposed to subjective, aspects of the story, and the use of the word 'travelogue' to describe the actual journey into the Congo, are not justified by the text. Conrad is at great pains to build up objectively the theme of imperial conquest: hence the whole long setting of the story in the Thames estuary, the evocation of the Roman Empire, &c. The irony of the end—the visit to the 'Intended'—is a part of this essential objectifying of the whole experience. Marlow himself is not a particularly interesting character, almost a minimal 'experiencing agent'. To see the story as essentially a 'journey within', a variant of 'the archetypal myth dramatised in much great literature since the Book of Job' is not merely to give a cock-eyed emphasis but to undervalue the power and profundity of Conrad's handling of the historical, moral, and psychological situations involved.

I think it is perverse to ignore, in a long discussion of *Lord Jim*, much of which (notably on the question whether Jim redeems himself on Patusan) is highly rewarding, the actual concrete emphasis on the nature and origin of Jim's 'soft spot', clarified especially in the second chapter of the novel. Surely one of the essential things to say about *Lord Jim* is that it is a study of the late nineteenth-century 'public-school type' or something like it, peculiarly English and with those particular strengths and weaknesses by which Conrad himself was at once attracted and repelled? The whole force of the key phrase 'He was one of us' depends on an analysis and recognition of who 'we' actually are.

Again, on *Nostromo*, though there are numerous incidental felicities in the discussion (notably on the ambiguous presentation of Decoud), I think it is perverse to complain, as Mr. Guerard does, about the constant shifts of 'point-of-view' in the organization of the novel. Why, having admitted Conrad's success in creating 'the illusion of a solid land existing and a teeming life continuing even after we are compelled to look away', does he object to the baffling of the 'normal if unconscious ambition of the reader to live vicariously through an imagined experience'? (Sometimes one feels that the word 'unconscious' is for Mr. Guerard justification enough for anything.) Is not the peculiar strength of Conrad's method in *Nostromo* precisely this achievement of an imagined whole—Costaguana itself—which is at the same time clearly defined and many-sided?

These examples—and they are central, not incidental—will indicate the approach that determines and limits, though it does not ruin, Mr. Guerard's view of Conrad. All the time the emphasis is towards the metaphysical, away from the actual. The author is too intelligent not to be aware of the dangers in this: it is, he remarks, 'only too easy (above all with a Conrad or a Faulkner) to stress the abstract and the symbolic at the expense of everything else.' But this

sensible observation does not prevent his quoting on the previous page in all seriousness an 'important essay' from which is abstracted the sentence (*The Nigger of the Narcissus* is under discussion): 'Fearful of overstressing the sub-aqueous world of the under-consciousness, the symbol-producing level of the psyche which, in fact, was the most dependable of his inspiration, Conrad overloaded his mundane treatment of the crew.' One should add at once in fairness that Mr. Guerard does not commit himself to this level of Jungian interpretation, yet it must also be said that it reflects his sympathies and the direction of his preoccupation. And while it is a preoccupation which is not unfruitful when brought to bear on certain aspects of Conrad's achievement—the more tortured and unresolved ones—it leads in the end to an image of the novels as less solidly based than they actually are. One cannot help wishing that this scrupulous critic had more often borne in mind another sentence of Conrad's: 'Fiction is history, human history, or it is nothing.'

A final detail. Mr. Guerard habitually uses the word 'impressionist' to describe the mature Conradian technique which he also defines (fairly enough) as 'a form bent on involving and implicating the reader in a psycho-moral drama which has no easy solution, and bent on engaging his sensibilities more strenuously and even more uncomfortably than ever before'. Surely this is a very eccentric use of the word 'impressionist' and adds another quite arbitrary complication to the already too difficult business of achieving an agreed set of useful terms in novel-criticism?

A. C. KETTLE

**The Third Voice. Modern British and American Verse Drama.** By DENIS DONOGHUE. Pp. vi+286. Princeton: University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1959. 30s. net.

Eliot's opinion that 'the human soul in intense emotion strives to express itself in verse' is duly recorded by Dr. Donoghue; elsewhere he notes that if verse drama has a theoretical justification it is its ability to record slight changes in feeling or attitude with the utmost precision. But *The Third Voice* is much less concerned to justify verse on the modern stage than to find out what has been achieved since Yeats published the first version of *The Shadowy Waters* in 1900. There is a rather sketchy chapter on Yeats himself; others deal with Auden; Cummings, Fry, Eberhart, Stevens, Macleish (one or two plays by each), and Pound's translation of the *Trachiniae*. This last receives high praise from Donoghue, although it is composed in a language which in rhythm and syntax is as nearly unlike modern English as Pound's versions of Arnaut Daniel. All these essays are side-dishes only, accessory to the six chapters on Eliot which make up rather more than a third of the book.

The criteria are plainly and persuasively expressed. An ideal dramatic verse, Donoghue writes, is that which, 'flexible and pliant, continuously adjusts itself to the slightest variations in intensity and tone'. Every word spoken in drama is an act; it must be sanctioned by character, situation, and plot; verse must not slide away from these into a condition of verbal autonomy, where self-conscious



metaphor and the poet's own voice oust the voices of the individual characters and eliminate the differences between them. A speech, however intense and high-wrought, must, to be truly dramatic, point forward, raise emotional problems to which the audience demands a solution (as is Shakespeare's way); otherwise it tends to become a moment of lyrical stasis and eventually, by brooding on its own beauty, to dissolve into what Donoghue effectively calls a 'limp aria'. The lines must be transparent, as Eliot has said, so that in reading or hearing them we are intent on what they point at. Donoghue thinks that such verse will almost invariably take its bearings from modern habits of speech. By these and other standards the verse of *The Ascent of F6*, for example, lacks flexibility and range (Donoghue is perceptive about the high prose and the 'solemn Shakespearean parody' in this play), Christopher Fry's characters all speak like Christopher Fry, and *Murder in the Cathedral* is 'an act of piety before it is a work of art'. By these standards, too, Eliot's plays have since steadily increased in subtlety, urbanity, and strength, in ability to sustain the tone, to fuse character with speech, and 'to suggest a human voice saying things'. In *The Confidential Clerk* and *The Elder Statesman* Eliot has finally contrived to write plays which express, in Marianne Moore's phrase, 'a tuned reticence'.

The chapters on Eliot are the best in the book, and they are very good indeed. The description of Eliot's evolution as a verse-dramatist cannot be seriously disputed if we accept the relevance to any estimate of his work of Donoghue's (and Eliot's) criteria for the making of a verse-play. It is controlled by a nice sense of the limitations of even Eliot's achievement:

Eliot has secured a certain amount of *force musculaire* for verse drama . . . but there is still an air-lock that is blocking verse-drama from some of the deepest areas of experience. Some years ago Dr. Williams . . . complained that Eliot's approach to actuality was still only partial. There is no getting around this; the defect is *there*: Eliot's is very much a Paleface theatre. (pp. 252-3)

For, although the main theme of *The Third Voice* is the way in which Eliot has achieved this *force musculaire*, its author does not avoid, at least in his discussion of Eliot, criticizing the subject-matter and the morality of the personages. The point of view here is more partisan and less convincing. Donoghue seems oddly unaware of the objections that can be made to *The Confidential Clerk*. He does not discuss the significant implausibilities of the discovery-scene (Professor Grover Smith's chapter on the play faced this labyrinth of permutations much more squarely), nor the failure to make Eggerson's slyly contrived transcendence seem more than an embarrassing trick, nor the insipidity of the central figure Colby: Harry Monchensey, for all his selfishness and self-dramatization, at least conveyed the unhappiness proper to a man and to a hero, but Colby, as Mr. Nicholas Brooke remarked in a penetrating criticism of the play, 'seems to be a sort of dumb waiter from whom everyone else can take his pick'.<sup>1</sup> Donoghue writes with fine sympathy about *The Elder Statesman*. It is, he says, a more humane play than *The Family Reunion*, but this is to disregard the cruelty, the positively theological ruthlessness, with which Gomez and Mrs. Carghill are

<sup>1</sup> 'The Confidential Clerk: a Theatrical Review', *Durham University Journal*, xlv (1954), 69.

handled. There is an implication that they are not to be regarded as having the same human status as Lord Claverton, Monica, or Charles: Donoghue refers to them as 'the sinister forces which [Lord Claverton] has carried within himself for many years' and as 'obnoxious familiars'. But if this is so, if they are projections of Lord Claverton's Id, lagoes (as some would read Shakespeare's play) to his Othello, then the unity of the play is flawed in the same way as *The Cocktail Party* is broken by the difficulty of accepting the Guardians on the realistic terms that are required for Edward and Lavinia, and Michael's position at the end of the play is completely bewildering. Has he been offered a job by a hypostasis of guilt or by a South American financier? If, on the other hand, Gomez and Mrs. Carghill are meant to have the same substantial reality as Lord Claverton, then, one feels (accepting for the moment the moral assumptions of the play), Claverton ought to consider more exigently what he has done to *them* as human beings; for, as Auden's Caliban was to Prospero, they remain his 'impervious disgrace. . . . That sprawls in the weeds and will not be repaired.'

The author is an alert, hard-thinking, and wide-ranging critic, and his book should be read by all students of Eliot. They will sometimes be distracted by his habit of quoting too frequently and too much in the manner of an epigone from the works of Kenneth Burke and Francis Fergusson, and there are far too many sentences which begin with phrases such as 'Professor Krutch has reported . . .' or 'Sir Herbert Read has asserted . . .'. But his own critical skill is constantly at work, and the last chapter in particular (on 'Theatre Poetry') looks forward to the useful book that Donoghue could some day give us on Elizabethan dramatic verse.

PETER URE

**James Joyce.** By RICHARD ELLMANN. Pp. xvi+842. New York and London: Oxford University Press, 1959. 63s. net.

No writer's life has ever been more intimately bound up with his work than was Joyce's. He said of himself that he was unimaginative, and in truth he had to base everything he wrote on an experience—his own, his father's, his brother's. Even *Finnegans Wake*, in theory the most 'dramatic' and least personal of his writings, is full of childhood memories and family allusions. The remark he made to someone who asked him if he would ever go back to Dublin—'Have I ever left it?'—points to a truth, and there are times when he reminds one of the description he makes Stephen Dedalus give of Shakespeare: 'He goes back, weary of the creation he has piled up to hide him from himself, an old dog, licking an old sore.' A critical biography was badly needed, for Gorman's 'authorized' life, informative though it is, was written during the lifetime and under the supervision of its subject (who made Gorman, for example, tone down the references to his early quarrels with his father), and Stanislaus Joyce, sadly, died before he could carry *My Brother's Keeper*—a fine book in its own right—to the point where he could have told us much that only he knew.

Mr. Ellmann's *James Joyce* admirably does all that we can want of it; it is readable, detailed, authoritative, and reliable, and will be indispensable to any-

one interested in the study of Joyce. He is only, and very infrequently, led astray by accepting Joyce's beliefs without checking them: thus, whatever Joyce may have thought, Ibsen did not in fact desert his wife (p. 221), and although Joyce may have been interested to be told so (and worked it into *Ulysses*), it is rather misleading to say that Sir Sidney Lee's 'real name' was Simon Lazarus (p. 425); nor was Arthur Symonds guilty of 'taking hashish for several years' (p. 116). It is not Mr. Ellmann's fault if the interest tends to fall off after Joyce leaves Ireland, for the relation between life and fiction is closest in Joyce's early years and biographical information at its most valuable for the Irish period. Nor was Joyce's life after he became an exile on the Continent an eventful one; he did not wish it to be so. All he asked was peace and leisure to devote himself to his writing. He was not interested in politics or public life, and even the two world wars presented themselves to him as merely tiresome interferences with the real business in hand. His life was heroic, in its endless struggle against poverty, blindness, and disaster in his family, but it was not romantic; Joyce indeed was a professedly anti-romantic figure.

It is not Mr. Ellmann's fault, either, if Joyce does not emerge from his book as a very attractive man. He had a bottomless contempt for the English middle class, and from the standpoint of the middle class he was a splendid example of all that is to be mistrusted in 'literary men'. He was a good husband, it is true (apart from some very mild flirtations), and a devoted father, but he was a sponger, a spendthrift, a tippler, and not a little of a cad. Of course he absorbed in his youth, and retained all his life, the aesthetic ideal of the artist as superior to all bourgeois conventions, but the middle class prefer to be treated with a contempt mitigated by a certain display of *panache*. Joyce was an unromantic Bohemian, seedy rather than splendid, withdrawn and colourless instead of flamboyant and extravagant. What is more depressing is his lack of interest, apart from accidental personal loyalties, such as his support for Italo Svevo, in other writers, and in the arts generally. He had nothing to say to Proust, and little to Eliot; his visual taste (not unnaturally, perhaps) was poor, and his musical taste very limited. In a very curious way he accepted most of the principles of aestheticism without being an aesthete; his creed was neither 'Art for Art's sake' nor 'Art for Life's sake', but 'Life for my Art's sake'.

His egotism, necessary as it may have been to his work, is not heart-warming. Mr. Ellmann does not try to soften the picture, although his account of Joyce's treatment of Miss Sylvia Beach over the Random House edition of *Ulysses* is more favourable to Joyce than Miss Beach's version. He gives a fairer account of Joyce's later coolness towards Miss Weaver, whose extraordinary generosity made the writing of *Finnegans Wake* possible; here it seems that Joyce's fierce loyalty to his own family overcame the gratitude which he genuinely felt. One may doubt, however, if really deep gratitude, indeed any genuine unselfishness, was possible for Joyce. The same might be said of lesser writers—for example, Rolfe—and of millions who have no talent at all. Joyce was a genius, and Mr. Ellmann is wise enough to know that what he created is far more important than what he was, and that his life is finally of interest only because of the art he created from it.

J. B. BAMBOROUGH

**Three Traditions of Moral Thought.** By DOROTHEA KROOK. Pp. xiv+356. Cambridge: University Press, 1959. 30s. net.

This book is based on lectures given at Cambridge to students reading for the paper on 'The English Moralists' in the English Tripos. Its object is twofold. In the first place 'to develop a theme concerning the nature of the moral life, and an interpretation of the history of English moral thought based on this view of the moral life'. In the second (and this is subsidiary), 'to indicate how the skills of literary criticism may be found useful in the study of philosophical works'.

The three traditions of the title are defined as the Christian-Platonic or religious, the Utilitarian or secular, and the Humanist. The first two are declared to be 'historically speaking fundamental', the third is described as a modern development from them. The sharp separation between the first two—'they are radically distinct interpretations of moral experience, in essential respects, indeed, mutually exclusive'—leads the author into a dichotomy which is too absolute, especially when she interprets it not simply as a matter of logic but in terms of historical personages. For her there is a sharp line to be drawn between those moralists who believe in the power of love to transform human nature and those who do not. Christians and Platonists are united in the importance they attach to love; the Utilitarians, on the other hand, fail to realize the part that love may play in moral experience. Between these two stand the Humanists who agree with the Christians and Platonists in recognizing the power of love, but who join the opposition in rejecting 'the reality or the necessity of a supernatural sanction for that transcendent order of values of which the crown is love'. Parallel with this is the separation between those who take what Mrs. Krook calls a 'high' view of human nature and those who take a 'low' one—'the first pitch their ideal of man as high as possible, the second pitch it as low as possible'. The Christians, the Platonists, and the Humanists are all in the first group, the Utilitarians in the second.

All this is very well, but very difficult to sustain historically in the writers Mrs. Krook chooses to illustrate her argument. For her, Plato, St. Paul, and St. Augustine represent the Platonic-Christian tradition; Aristotle, Hobbes, and Hume, the Utilitarian; and John Stuart Mill, Matthew Arnold, F. H. Bradley, and D. H. Lawrence the Humanist. To lump Plato and St. Paul together in opposition to Aristotle is a dangerous procedure. The Catholic might look askance at the notion of Aristotle as the enemy of Faith, and while there is obviously some truth in the view that Aristotle's ethics have a utilitarian bias, this is put in an extreme form when she declares that 'Hobbes's doctrine in *Leviathan* is, in short, Aristotle's taken to its logical conclusion'. Again, she tries to drive too large a wedge between Plato and Aristotle, exaggerating their differences on the relation between politics and ethics and crying down the importance of the *summum bonum* in Aristotle's moral theory.

Mrs. Krook's chapter on Hobbes is excellent, but in dealing with Hume we find her again lopping off the awkward limbs that do not fit her Procrustean bed and she quotes with approval Mr. T. S. Eliot's dubious dictum that the eighteenth century is the most *unlovely* period in the history of Christianity in England.

But the third section of her book is the most polemical. Mrs. Krook sees the Humanist tradition as holding fast to what is valuable in religion, its morality of love, but admires it for cutting loose from religious dogma. John Stuart Mill (*Three Essays on Religion*), Matthew Arnold (*Literature and Dogma*), and F. H. Bradley (*Ethical Studies*) are all reinterpretations of orthodox Christianity which discard the dogma and retain morality. Humanism supersedes and transforms the Christian Faith just as Christianity itself transcended and yet fulfilled the Mosaic Law. The unique contribution of Humanism, for Mrs. Krook, is its 'affirmation of sexual love as the supremely redemptive form of love', and she takes D. H. Lawrence's *The Man Who Died* as the prophetic text which approximates most closely to the combination of *agape* and *eros* she upholds. But in her insistence that 'Humanism . . . is Messianic in character' she is trying to eat her Christianity and have it too. We can reject Christ as a historical figure (which is what Lawrence's rewriting of the Gospel story amounts to) and make Him a myth, but it is difficult to see how we can do this and still claim Him as the Messiah. Mrs. Krook ends her discussion of Lawrence thus: 'the Humanist is still in the grave, awaiting the true Annunciation. But this is the most obscure and mysterious part of the religious Humanism I have been discussing, and it is impossible to say more about it here.' But one would have to say a great deal more before accepting even a modified version of *The Man Who Died* in place of the Gospel narrative. Even if one rejects Mrs. Krook's argument, however, one cannot fail to be impressed by the clarity with which she presents it and by the passionate sincerity and high seriousness of this book.

R. L. BRETT

## SHORT NOTICES

**Squyer Meldrum.** By SIR DAVID LINDSAY. Edited by JAMES KINSLEY. Pp. vi+122. (Nelson's Medieval and Renaissance Library). London and Edinburgh: Nelson, 1959. 10s. net.

This is an excellent edition of a poem which if not Lindsay's 'masterpiece', as Professor C. S. Lewis enthusiastically terms it, is an entertaining piece of story-telling that deserves to be as well known as the *Satire of the Thrie Estaitis*. Lindsay claims to have been a friend of William Meldrum, 'vmquhyle Laird of Cleische and Bynniss', and his poem, though cast in the form of a romance, is intended to be a serious biography, commemorating 'the virtues and deeds of a great man intimately known and lately dead'.

The best feature of Professor Kinsley's edition is undoubtedly the introduction, which is entertainingly written—D'Arcy, Regent of Scotland, speeds to an ambush with 'the urgency of a modern flying squad' (p. 11)—and highly informative. He illuminates the poem's social and literary context; its panegyric mood; its debt to the narrative conventions and vocabulary of chivalric romance; and its place in the distinctively Scottish tradition of the *Bruce* and the *Wallace*. Even from the scanty records of Lindsay's life he culls an apposite quotation: 'the triumphand justynis, the terribill turnements, the fechtyn on fut in barras', to which Lindsay refers with such enthusiasm in his letter from Antwerp, are clearly what stirred him most in Squire Meldrum's 'douchtie' career.

Mr. Kinsley's evaluation of the poem is sympathetic, but not uncritical. He points out its episodic structure, and acknowledges a lack of psychological subtlety—Lindsay's Chaucerian disclaimer, 'For I am not in lufe expart' (l. 1157), is all too true. The occasional echoes of *Troilus*, such as the ominous animal dream or the woodbind image (l. 991),



only accentuate the coarsening of tone. The poem's chief strength lies in its swift narrative pace and the comic vitality of such scenes as that in which the Lady of Gleneagles parries the questions of her over-inquisitive maids; its chief weakness is the poverty and repetitiveness of much of the language, which Mr. Kinsley explains—in terms of oral narrative tradition—but cannot explain away.

The text is based (with little change, apart from a modernized punctuation) on the carefully printed edition of 1594, the earliest extant. It is provided with an ample glossary, and with notes, which in their elucidation of 'the morality and *mœurs* . . . of Lindsay's Scotland' admirably supplement the introduction. The presentation, of both text and apparatus, is pleasing; altogether, the work forms an excellent start to Nelson's new series.

PRISCILLA PRIESTON

**The Diaries of John Ruskin.** Selected and edited by JOAN EVANS and JOHN HOWARD WHITEHOUSE. Vol. II, 1848-1873, pp. x+365-770; Vol. III, 1874-1889, pp. x+771-1210. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958, 1959. 70s. net each.

The first volume of these diaries was reviewed in *R.E.S.*, N.S. ix (1958), 229-31, and what was said there unfortunately applies to the second and third, which complete the work. In particular, many of Ruskin's notes on buildings and paintings are omitted, which, though they may only duplicate his published work (we are not told they do), might with advantage have displaced some of the scrupulously preserved remarks about the weather and Ruskin's health.

It is interesting to read, albeit in vague terms (p. 489), of a quarrel with Turner; and that Ruskin considered his lectures in the Michaelmas Term 1883 a success (pp. 1050-1), which other people did not. Some passages bear on Dr. Evans's claim, in her biography of Ruskin, that the diaries show the spontaneity of his literary style:

See if next *Fors* will construct on explanation of impossibility to get good laws made to flog people. We won't flog you—far be it from us; we won't teach you—far be it from us; we won't in any way interfere with you—far be it from us to touch the liberties of the subject. We will only suck your blood, so long as you allow us to fasten on your throats like bats, and on your legs like leeches; by all means, free Britons, talk and walk as you please.

What such passages show is that ideas first occurred to Ruskin in rhetorical form, which is not quite Dr. Evans's claim.

Otherwise, the interest of these diaries is only in the rare, normal, good-humoured observations, such as anyone might make.

C. H. SALTER

## SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

### ANGLIA

Band 78, Heft 2, 1960

- Aldrediana X: *Manifesta* (G. C. Britton and A. S. C. Ross), 129-68.  
William Hereberts Übersetzungen (H. Gneuss), 169-92.  
ME. Poems of Protest (R. H. Robbins), 193-203.  
Structural Irony within the *Summoner's Tale* (E. Birney), 204-18.

BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY  
Vol. lxiii, No. 1, September 1960

- The Court Festivals of Henry VII (S. Anglo), 12-45.  
'Tragic-Comical-Historical-Pastoral': Elizabethan Dramatic Nomenclature (A. Nicoll), 70-87.  
The Text of Mill's *Autobiography* (J. Stillinger), 220-42.

### CRITICAL QUARTERLY

Vol. ii, No. 1, Spring 1960

- The Decline of Magic in Art and Politics (J. W. Lewis), 7-23.  
Analysis: Chaucer's *Prologue* ll. 1-18 (J. F. Danby), 28-32.  
Lawrence and Tolstoy (R. Williams), 33-39.  
Dryden's Couplets: Imagery Vowed to Poverty (McD. Emalie), 51-57.  
A Dickens Landscape (C. B. Cox), 58-60.  
Sheep and Goats [functions of criticism] (L. Lerner), 64-71.  
Evelyn Waugh and the Mysteriously Disappearing Hero (A. E. Dyson), 72-79.

Vol. ii, No. 2, Summer 1960

- Charles Dickens: A Haunting (A. Wilson), 101-8.  
*Lord of the Flies* (C. B. Cox), 112-17.  
In but not of: A Study of Julian Bell (F. Grubb), 120-6.  
Story and Idea in Conrad's *The Shadow-Line* (I. Watt), 133-48.  
Analysis: Walter de la Mare's *The Listeners* (A. E. Dyson), 150-4.  
Further Notes on [Lawrence and] *Anna Karenina* (H. Gifford), 158-60.  
Symposium: The Living Theatre (R. Walker, V. Gielgud, N. Nicholson), 161-70.

Vol. ii, No. 3, Autumn 1960

- The Poetry of Wallace Stevens (G. Hough), 201-18.

Cleavage and Culture (C. L. Mowat), 223-32.

The Idea of a Literary Élite (M. Bradbury), 233-8.

The Defeatism of *The Waste Land* (D. Craig), 241-52.

Analysis: Yeats's *Byzantium* (G. S. Fraser), 253-61.

### DISCOURSE

Vol. iii, No. 2, April 1960

- Romeo and Juliet* as Renaissance *Vita Nuova* (J. Satin), 67-85.

### ENGLISH STUDIES

Vol. xli, No. 5, October 1960

- On the Structure of Henry James's *Metaphors* (A. Holder), 289-97.  
On the Preposition *Over* (J. Söderlind), 298-305.  
Chaucer's Pronunciation of French *u* (G. Storms), 305-8.  
*Sterne* as Plagiarist (J. M. Stedmond), 308-12.  
Virginia Woolf and Bergson's 'Mémoire par Excellence' (S. K. Kumar), 313-18.  
Joyce and Norway (K. Smidt), 318-21.  
Current Literature, 1959: Prose, Poetry, Drama (F. T. Wood), 340-6.

Index to Vols. i (1919)-xl (1959), 1960

### ESSAYS IN CRITICISM

Vol. x, No. 3, July 1960

- Pound's *Homage to Propertius*: The Structure of a Mask (J. P. Sullivan), 239-49.  
The First Paragraph of *The Ambassadors*: an Explication (I. Watt), 250-74.  
'Wilderness of Tigers': Structure and Symbolism in *Titus Andronicus* (A. Sommers), 275-89.  
The Moral and Poetic Structure of *The Changeling* (C. Ricks), 290-306.  
The Systolic Rhythm: The Structure of Coleridge's Conversation Poems (A. Gerard), 307-19.  
The Novelist as Moralist and the Moralist as Critic (D. May), 320-8.  
Critical Forum: The New Criticism; *Comus*; English in the University, 359-72.

### ÉTUDES ANGLAISES

XIII<sup>e</sup> Année, No. 3, juillet-septembre 1960

- Notes sur le vocabulaire astronomique

et astrologique de Shakespeare (G. Mon-sarrat), 319-30.

Marston's *Metamorphosis of Pigmali-on*  
*Image: a Mock-Epyllion* (G. Cross),  
331-6.

La langue et le style de Melville (J.-J.  
Mayoux), 337-45.

La satire dans les nouvelles de Sir Osbert  
Sitwell (A. Guimbretière), 346-58.

#### HUNTINGTON LIBRARY QUARTERLY

Vol. xxiii, No. 4, August 1960

Francis Bacon and Lionel Cranfield (R.  
C. Johnson), 301-20.

*The Widow's Tears* and the Other Chap-man (S. Schoenbaum), 321-38.

Surrey at Boulogne (M. B. Davies),  
339-48.

Francis Bacon's Advice to Fulke Greville  
on Research Techniques (V. F. Snow),  
369-78.

Thorn-Drury's Notes on George Wither  
(J. M. French), 379-88.

The Latin Oration in *A Game at Chess*  
(G. R. Price), 389-93.

#### MEDIUM ÆVUM

Vol. xxix, No. 1, 1960

Pellinor's Death in the *Suite du Merlin*  
and the *Palamedes* (F. Bogdanow), 1-9.

The Meaning of the Corpus Christi  
Carol (R. L. Greene), 10-21.

Eve's 'Leaps' in the *Ancrene Riwle* (R.  
E. Kaske), 22-24.

Essai sur la formation de la versification  
latine d'accent au Moyen Âge (J.  
Chailley), 49-80.

#### MODERN FICTION STUDIES

Vol. vi, No. 3, Autumn 1960

Thomas Hardy number (Critical articles  
and selected checklist by various contri-butors), 195-279.

#### MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

Vol. lv, No. 4, October 1960

Philippa Pan, Philippa Chaucer (M.  
Galway), 481-7.

A German Analogue for *A Tale of a Tub*  
(C. J. Horne and H. Powell), 488-96.

The Shaping of Blake's *America* (W. H.  
Stevenson), 497-503.

Anthony Munday, John Heardson, and  
the Authorship of *Fedele and Fortunio*  
(R. Hosley), 504-5.

*Lazarillo de Tormes*, a Jest-book, and  
Benedik (K. P. Chapman), 505-7.

*A Modest Proposal* and the Bible (R. A.  
Greenberg), 508-9.

The Symbolism of Shelley's Nightingales  
(N. F. Ford), 509-74.

Emilie von Berlepach and Burns (A.  
Gillies), 584-7.

*General Index to Vols. xxxi-l, 1960*

#### MODERN PHILOLOGY

Vol. lviii, No. 1, August 1960

The Burial Mound in *Guthlac A* (L. K.  
Shook), 1-10.

An Elizabethan Manuscript 'Continua-tion'  
of Sir John Davies' *Nosce Teipsum*  
(R. H. Bowers), 11-19.

Bulwer and his *Lady* (D. Ganzel), 41-52.

#### NEUPHILOLOGISCHE MITTEILUNGEN

Vol. lxi, No. 2, 1960

Appositional Constructions in OE. Prose  
(N. Peltola), 159-203.

Notes on Two Fifteenth-century Scots  
Poems (P. J. Frankis), 203-13.

Subjective Conflict in Shakespearean  
Tragedy (J. W. Draper), 214-21.

Two Painters: Joyce Cary and Gulley  
Jimson (T. F. Mustanoja), 221-44.

Vol. lxi, No. 3, 1960

Chaucer's 'Gentil' Manciple and his  
'Gentil' Tale (E. Birney), 257-67.

The Source of Capgrave's *Life of St.  
Katharine of Alexandria* (A. Kurvinen),  
268-324.

#### NOTES AND QUERIES

Vol. vii, N.S. No. 9, September 1960

*Beowulf*: The 'Tydre Treowlogan Tyne',  
324.

Plutarch's Daemons in Shakespeare,  
324-7.

Motley, 327.

De Witt's Sketch of the Swan, 328.

Shakespeare and Daniel, 328-9.

Hamlet's Reason [III. i. 166], 329-31.

The Fool's 'Prophecy' in *King Lear*,  
331-2.

*Macbeth*, II. ii. 61-63, 332-3.

*Macbeth*, v. iii. 22, 333-4.

Shakespeare Oddities, 334-5.

*Antony and Cleopatra* and *The Legend of  
Good Women*, 335-6.

Marston, Jonson, and *The Spanish Tra-gedy*  
Additions, 336-7.

Webster and Marston [*The White Devil*,  
v. iii. 106], 337.

Some Stage Directions in *A Shoemaker,  
A Gentleman*, 337-8.

James Shirley and *Mercurius Britannicus*,  
338-9.

The Minshull Family, 339-42.

Visitation, Guetre: Two Predatings, 343.

The Swinburne Letters and *O.E.D.*,  
346-7.

Fair Em and Robert Wilson, 348-9, 360.

Vol. vii, N.S. No. 10, October 1960

The 'Rede Wynde' in *The Siege of  
Jerusalem*, 363-4.

- 'Sum Rex, Sum Princeps' . . ., [*Piers Plowman*, B Prol. 132-8], 364.  
 'Ex Officio' in the Sixteenth Century, 365-6.  
 Notes on More's *Utopia*, 366-7.  
 Sir David Lindsay, 367-8.  
 Surrey Poems in the Blage MS., 368-70.  
 Chaucer's *Troilus* as an Elizabethan 'Wanton Book', 370-1.  
 The Price of the *Cronica Cronicarum* in 1566, 371.  
 Notes to Cavendish's *Life of Wolsey*, 372.  
 Stephen Gosson and Homer's *Iliades* in a *Nutte Shell*, 372-3.  
 The Authorship of *The Arte of Angling*, 1577, 373-6.  
 'Astronaut', 376-7.  
 Biographical Notes on Richard Fletcher, 377-8.  
 Nashe, Munster, and *An Almond for a Parrat*, 378-80.  
 The Family of John Donne, 1588-91, 380-6.  
 John Donne Redone and Undone, 386.  
 Bacon and Donne, 386-7.  
 'Serendipity', 387-9.  
 'Jingler', 'Man John': Two Words from Disraeli, 389.
- Vol. vii, N.S. No. 11, November 1960  
 'Olympiad', 403.  
 'In what estate so euer I be' [Green's *Early English Carols*, No. 370], 403-4.  
 Chaucer's *Prologue*, A 673, 404-6.  
 George Wither, 407-8.  
 The Background of the Stuart Culpepers, 408-16.  
 Perfect Contrition [*Measure for Measure*], 416-19.  
 The 'Artificial Sea' in Jonson's *Masque of Blacknesse*, 419-21.  
*The White Devil*, 421.  
 Lydgate's *The Dolorous Pyte* . . . and Herbert's *The Sacrifice*, 421.  
 Comus and Plutarch's Daemons, 421-3.  
 'Peloni Almoni, Cosmopolites', 424.  
 A Supplement to *The Life Records of John Milton*, 424-5.  
 Animal Sources for Milton's Sin and Death, 425-6.  
 The Life of Milton in *The History of King-killers*, 426.  
 Cowley's Elegy on John Littleton, 426-7.  
 New Words and Antedatings from Cudworth, 427-32.  
*Piers Plowman*, B Prol. 132-8 [Reply to N. & Q., vii, 10, Oct. 1960, p. 364], 436.
- NINETEENTH-CENTURY FICTION  
 Vol. xv, No. 2, September 1960  
 Mark Twain's *Old Times on the Mississippi* (P. Schmidt), 95-111.  
 Jane Austen and the Dance of Fidelity and Complaissance (L. Elsbree), 113-36.  
 Structure and Allegory in *The Great Stone Face* (J. J. Lynch), 137-46.  
 The Problem of Structure in Trollope (J. Thale), 147-57.  
 The Image of the Book in *Wuthering Heights* (R. C. McKibben), 159-69.  
 Melville's 'Best Authorities' (T. Philbrick), 171-9.  
 Hawthorne's Oak Tree Image (V. O. Birdsall), 181-5.
- NOTTINGHAM MEDIEVAL STUDIES  
 Vol. iv, 1960  
 The Bewcastle Cross (R. I. Page), 36-57.
- PRINCETON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY  
 CHRONICLE  
 Vol. xxi, No. 4, Summer 1960  
 Sebastian Brant and the First Illustrated Edition of Vergil (T. K. Rabb), 187-99.  
 Letters of English Authors: From the Collection of Robert H. Taylor; Catalogue of an Exhibition [with excerpts] (introd. W. S. Dix), 200-36.
- PROCEEDINGS OF THE HUGUENOT SOCIETY OF LONDON  
 Vol. xx, No. 1, 1959  
 Thomas Vautroullier, Printer and Bookseller [1564-87] (W. R. LeFanu), 12-25.  
 Jean Loiseau de Tourval: A Huguenot Translator in England, 1603-31 (A. Clarke), 36-59.
- PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION  
 Vol. lxxv, No. 4, Parts 1 & 2, September 1960  
 Literary Satire in the *House of Fame* (A. David), 333-9.  
 A Shakespeare Sonnet Group (B. Stirling), 340-9.  
 The Concept of the Second Eve in *Paradise Lost* (Mother M. C. Pecheux, O.S.U.), 359-66.  
 Dr. Johnson's Letters to Richardson (T. C. D. Eaves), 377-81.  
 Doctor Johnson and William Law (K. C. Balderston), 382-94.  
 Byron and the Story of Francesca da Rimini (F. L. Beaty), 395-401.  
*Villette* and the Life of the Mind (R. A. Colby), 410-19.  
 Hawthorne's Bulky Puritans (J. F. Ragan), 420-3.  
*The Ambassadors*: A new View (O. Cargill), 439-52.  
 Objective Interpretation (E. D. Hirsch, Jr.), 463-79.  
 A New Source for *Othello*? (P. N. Siegel), 480.  
 Ophelia's 'Bonny Sweet Robin' (E. S. Le Comte), 480.

## RENAISSANCE AND MODERN STUDIES

Vol. iv, 1960

- D. H. Lawrence as I saw him (H. Corke), 5-13.  
 Usury and High Finance in the Age of Shakespeare and Jonson (R. Ashton), 14-43.  
 A Problem of Hegel's Aesthetics (R. S. Lucas), 82-118.  
 Propaganda and Hard Facts in Charles Reade's Didactic Novels (S. M. Smith), 135-49.

## RESEARCH STUDIES

Vol. xxviii, No. 3, September 1960

- Hamlet's Second Chance (J. Wasson), 117-24.

## SEWANEE REVIEW

Vol. lxxviii, No. 4, Autumn 1960

- Literature as Persuasion (R. Whittemore), 565-75.  
 Yeats's Alembic (T. R. Whitaker), 576-94.  
 The Critic and the Dated Text (G. Tillotson), 595-602.  
 Nomad, Monada ... [Rev. of E. Vivas, *D. H. Lawrence*] (R. B. Heilman), 635-59.

## SHAKESPEARE QUARTERLY

Vol. xi, No. 2, Spring 1960

- The 'Capability' of Shakespeare (C. Leech), 123-36.  
 The Bastard in *King John* (J. C. Van de Water), 137-46.  
 Cleopatra's Tragedy (L. J. Mills), 147-62.  
 Dr. Johnson and the Bibliographical Criticism of Shakespeare (R. E. Scholes), 163-72.  
 William Boyce's 'Solemn Dirge' (C. Haywood), 173-88.  
 Shakespeare: An Annotated Bibliography for 1959 (R. W. Dent), 239-307.

## STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY

Vol. lvii, No. 2, April 1960

- Wolsey and Skelton's *Magnificence* (W. O. Harris), 99-122.  
 Thematic Unity in the *New Arcadia* (W. R. Davis), 123-43.  
 The Dramatic Triad in *Hamlet* (O. B. Hardison, Jr.), 144-64.  
 Augustus Toplady and Quarles's *Emblems* (A. C. Howell), 178-85.  
 Theme and Structure in *Paradise Regained* (B. K. Lewalski), 186-220.  
 Literature of the Renaissance in 1959: A Bibliography, 221-429.

Vol. lvii, No. 3, July 1960

- The 'Limitour' of Chaucer's Time and his 'Limitacioun' (A. Williams), 463-78.  
 Was the Green Knight a Fiend? (D. B. J. Randall), 479-91.  
 The Canon of Sir John Suckling's Poems (L. A. Beaurline), 492-518.  
 Equivocation in Cibber's *Love's Last Shift* (P. E. Parnell), 519-34.  
 Charles Dickens and the American Civil War (J. O. Waller), 535-48.  
 The Genesis of Conrad's *Amy Foster* (R. Herndon), 549-66.

## TEXAS STUDIES IN LITERATURE AND LANGUAGE

Vol. ii, No. 2, Summer 1960

- David Hume: Some Unpublished Letters (G. Hunter), 127-50.  
 Poe and the Southern Literary Tradition (J. B. Hubbell), 151-71.  
 Poe's *The Black Cat* (J. W. Gargano), 172-9.  
 Images of Illusion in the Work of Iris Murdoch (J. Gindin), 180-8.  
 Symbolic Characterisation in the Work of Iris Murdoch (M. Felheim), 189-97.  
 The Polyp as a Symbol in Blake (P. Miner), 198-205.  
 Lawrence's Annotation of Ouspensky's *Tertium Organum* (E. W. Tedlock, Jr.), 206-18.  
 Virtue and Passion: The Dialectic of *Eloina to Abelard* (B. P. O. Hehir), 219-32.  
 The Text of *Gulliver's Travels* (P. Danchin), 233-50.

## UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO QUARTERLY

Vol. xxx, No. 1, October 1960

- Henry James and Zola's *Roman expérimental* (L. H. Powers), 16-30.  
*Abalom* Reconsidered (D. H. Stewart), 31-44.  
 Equilibrium in the Poetry of Matthew Arnold (A. Brick), 45-56.  
 Irony and Humour in the *Rambler* (A. T. Elder), 57-71.  
 W. B. Yeats: Variations on the Visionary Quest (A. Zwerdling), 72-85.

## VICTORIAN STUDIES

Vol. iv, No. 1, September 1960

- Beyond the Liberal Imagination: Vision and Unreality in *Daniel Deronda* (R. Preyer), 33-54.

## UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

EDWIN MORGAN  
J. A. M. RILLIE



## LIST OF PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

[Unless otherwise stated, London is the place and 1960 the date of publication.]

- ABRAMS, M. H. *The Mirror and the Lamp*. Romantic theory and the critical tradition. Pp. xii+406. New York; London. [Reprint.] 15s.
- ALEKSEEV, M. P. *12 Istorii Angliiskoi Literatury*. Pp. 500. Leningrad and Moscow. R. 12.85.
- ALLEN, D. C. *Image and Meaning*. Metaphoric Traditions in Renaissance Poetry. Pp. viii+176. Baltimore; London. 32s.
- ALLOTT, M. Elizabeth Gaskell. Pp. 46. 2s. 6d.
- ANDERSON, C. R. *Emily Dickinson's Poetry: Stairway of Surprise*. Pp. xviii+334. New York. \$5.95.
- ARNOLD, M. *Culture and Anarchy*, ed. J. Dover Wilson. Pp. xl+242. Cambridge. [Reprint.] 8s. 6d.
- *Essays, Letters, and Reviews*, coll. and ed. F. Neiman. Pp. xvi+398. Cambridge, Mass.; London. 72s.
- *On the Classical Tradition*, ed. R. H. Super (Complete Works, Vol. I). Pp. x+272. Ann Arbor. \$6.50.
- BARBOUR, *The Bruce*, ed. A. Kinghorn. Pp. 90. Edinburgh and London. 8s. 6d.
- BARISH, J. A. *Ben Jonson and the Language of Prose Comedy*. Pp. xii+336. Cambridge, Mass.; London. 40s.
- BEEK, W. J. A. *John Keble's Literary and Religious Contribution to the Oxford Movement*. Pp. xvi+192. Nijmegen, 1959.
- BENNETT, H. S. *Life on the English Manor*. Pp. xvi+364. Cambridge. [Reprint.] 13s. 6d.
- BERRY, H. *Sir John Suckling's Poems and Letters from Manuscript*. Pp. 124. London, Ontario. \$3.00.
- BLOOMFIELD, B. C. *New Verse in the '30s*. Pp. 22. 4s.
- BOWEN, M. *The Long Encounter*. Self and Experience in the Writings of Herman Melville. Pp. viii+282. Chicago; London. 40s.
- BRADBROOK, M. C. *Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy*. Pp. viii+276. Cambridge. [Reprint.] 12s. 6d.
- BRANDIS, I. *The Ladder of Vision. A Study of Images in Dante's Comedy*. Pp. 212. 25s.
- BREWER, D. S. *Chaucer*. Pp. x+198. [2nd edn.] 15s.
- BROWN, I. *Shakespeare in his Time*. Pp. viii+238. Edinburgh. 21s.
- BULLOUGH, G. *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*. Vol. III, pp. xvi+512. London; New York. 45s.
- BURNS, R. *Selected Poems*, ed. G. S. Fraser. Pp. vi+186. 9s. 6d.
- CAPPON, L. J. (ed.). *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*. The Complete Correspondence between Thomas Jefferson and Abigail and John Adams. Vol. I, pp. liv+282; Vol. II, pp. viii+x+283-638. Chapel Hill, 1959; London, 1960. £5.
- CASPER, L. *Robert Penn Warren. The Dark and Bloody Ground*. Pp. xx+212. Seattle. \$4.75.
- CHAPMAN, G. *Bussy d'Amboise*, ed. with notes and French translation by J. Jacquot. Pp. clix+206. Paris.
- CHAUCE, G. *The Parlement of Foulys*, ed. D. S. Brewer. Pp. viii+168. 12s. 6d.
- CHESTRE, T. *Sir Launfal*, ed. A. J. Bliss. Pp. 154. 12s. 6d.
- COHEN, J. M. *Robert Graves*. Pp. iv+120. Edinburgh; London. 3s. 6d.
- COHEN, J. M. and M. J. *The Penguin Dictionary of Quotations*. Pp. vi+664. Harmondsworth. 10s. 6d.
- COHN, R. G. *The Writer's Way in France*. Pp. 448. Philadelphia; London. 40s.
- COOPER, J. F. *Letters and Journals*, ed. J. F. Beard. Vol. I, pp. xli+444; Vol. II, pp. x+420. Cambridge, Mass.; London. £8.
- CRAWFORD, T. *Burns. A Study of the Poems and Songs*. Pp. xvi+400. Edinburgh and London. 35s.
- DAICHES, D. *The Novel and the Modern World*. Pp. x+220. Chicago; Cambridge. [2nd edn.] 35s.
- DANBY, J. F. *The Simple Wordsworth. Studies in the Poems 1797-1807*. Pp. viii+152. 18s.
- DANCHIN, P. *Francis Thompson. La Vie et l'œuvre d'un poète*. Pp. 554. Paris, 1959. N.F. 28.00.
- DAVIES, H. S. *The Poets and their Critics*. Vol. I, Chaucer to Collins. Pp. 240. [Revd. edn.] 13s. 6d.
- DAVIS, B. H. *Johnson before Boswell. A Study of Sir John Hawkins' Life of Samuel Johnson*. Pp. xii+222. New Haven; London. 36s.
- DE NAGY, N. C. *The Poetry of Ezra Pound. The Pre-Imagist Stage*. Pp. 184. Bern. S.Fr. 18.00.
- DOBRES, B. (ed.). *Five Heroic Plays*. Pp. xvi+418. 8s. 6d.

- DUNLEAVY, G. W. *Colum's Other Island. The Irish at Lindsfarne*. Pp. x+150. Madison, Wis. \$4.50.
- DUNN, C. W. *The Foundling and the Werwolf. A Literary-historical Study of Guillaume de Palerne*. Pp. viii+158. Toronto; London. 40s.
- ELLIOTT, R. C. *The Power of Satire: Magic, Ritual, Art*. Pp. xii+300. Princeton; London. 48s.
- ELLRODT, R. *L'Inspiration personnelle et l'esprit du temps chez les poètes métaphysiques anglais. Première partie, Tome I, John Donne et les poètes de la tradition chrétienne*, pp. 460; *Tome II, Poètes de transition, poètes mystiques*, pp. 490. Paris. N.F. 26.00 and 30.00 resp.
- ENGEL, S. M. *The Problem of Tragedy*. Pp. 82. Fredericton, New Brunswick. \$3.50.
- ESSAYS BY DIVERS HANDS, being the Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature, N.S. Vol. XXX, ed. N. H. Wallis. Pp. xii+160. 15s.
- EVANS, B. *Shakespeare's Comedies*. Pp. xiv+338. Oxford. 42s.
- FERGUSON, A. B. *The Indian Summer of English Chivalry. Studies in the Decline and Transformation of Chivalric Idealism*. Pp. xviii+242. Durham, N.C.; London. 48s.
- FINK, F. S. *Heads Across the Sea. An Album of Eighteenth-Century English Literary Portraits in America*. Pp. xvi+252. Charlottesville, Virginia. \$10.00.
- FLASDIECK, H. M. *Britannica. Festschrift for, ed. W. Iser and H. Schabram*. Pp. 270. Heidelberg. DM. 32.00.
- FRASER, G. S. *Ezra Pound*. Pp. iv+118. Edinburgh; London. 3s. 6d.
- FRIEDMAN, N. E. E. *Cummings. The art of his Poetry*. Pp. x+196. London; Baltimore. 27s. 6d.
- GETTMANN, R. A. *A Victorian Publisher. A Study of the Bentley Papers*. Pp. xii+272. Cambridge. 40s.
- GILGAMESH, *EPIC OF*, tr. N. K. Sandars. Pp. 128. Harmondsworth. 3s. 6d.
- GITTINGS, R. (ed.). *The Living Shakespeare*. Pp. vi+154. 12s. 6d.
- GORDON, I. L. (ed.). *The Seafarer*. Pp. x+70. 7s. 6d.
- GREENE, D. J. *The Politics of Samuel Johnson*. Pp. xx+354. New Haven; London. 44s.
- GUIDI, A. (ed.). *Lirica Elisabetiana*. Pp. 172. Naples. L. 1600.
- HAIG, R. L. *The Gazetteer 1735-1797. A Study in the Eighteenth-Century English Newspaper*. Pp. xii+336. Carbon-dale, Ill.; Nottingham. 68s.
- HARDY, T. *Poems*, sel. and ed. W. E. Williams. Pp. 220. Harmondsworth. 3s. 6d.
- HAYDON, B. R. *Diary*, ed. W. B. Pope. Vol. I, pp. xxvi+496; Vol. II, pp. 554. Cambridge, Mass.; London. £8.
- HENLEY, F., and STAM, D. H. *Wordsworth Criticism 1945-1959. An Annotated Bibliography*. Pp. 62. New York. \$2.00.
- HERBERT, D. (ed.). *Penguin Book of Narrative Verse*. Pp. xvi+462. Harmondsworth. 5s.
- HERBERT, G. *Selected Poems*, with some representative poems by his contemporaries, ed. D. Brown. Pp. 160. 10s. 6d.
- HIGGINSON, F. H. *Anna Livia Plurabelle. The Making of a Chapter*. Pp. 112. Minneapolis; London. 30s.
- HIRSCH, Jr., E. D. *Wordsworth and Schelling. A Typological Study of Romanticism*. Pp. xiv+214. New Haven; London. 32s.
- HOUGH, G. *Image and Experience. Studies in a Literary Revolution*. Pp. x+228. 21s.
- *Reflections on a Literary Revolution*. Pp. vi+128. Washington, D.C. \$2.95.
- JACQUOT, J. (ed.). *Les Fêtes de la Renaissance. Vol. II: Fêtes et cérémonies au temps de Charles Quint*. Pp. 518+47 plates. Paris. N.F. 45.00.
- JEFFERSON, D. W. *Henry James*. Pp. iv+120. Edinburgh; London. 3s. 6d.
- JOHN, E. *Land Tenure in Early England*. Pp. xii+184. Leicester. 30s.
- JONES, D. E. *The Plays of T. S. Eliot*. Pp. xiv+242. 28s.
- JONES, R. T. (ed.). *Sir Gawain and the Grene Gome*. Pp. 132. Pietermaritzburg. 15s.
- JONSON, B. *Bartholomew Fair*, ed. E. A. Horsman. Pp. xxxvi+178. 18s.
- JOSEPH, B. *Acting Shakespeare*. Pp. xvi+200. 25s.
- KAUFMANN, W. *The Owl and the Nightingale. From Shakespeare to Existentialism*. Pp. x+404. 30s.
- KENNEDY, C. W. (tr.). *An Anthology of Old English Verse*. Pp. xvi+174. New York; London. 12s.
- KERMODE, F. *Wallace Stevens*. Pp. iv+134. Edinburgh; London. 3s. 6d.
- (ed.). *The Living Milton*. Pp. x+178. 21s.
- KETTON-CREMER, R. W. *Lapidary Verse*. Pp. 237-54 (Proc. Brit. Acad. XLV). 3s. 6d.
- KNIGHTS, L. C. *An Approach to Hamlet*. Pp. 92. 12s. 6d.
- KREISSMAN, B. *Pamela-Shamela*. Pp. viii+98. Lincoln, Nebraska. \$1.50.

## LIST OF PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

115

- KROEBER, K. *Romantic Narrative Art*. Pp. xii+226. Madison, Wis. \$5.75.
- LAWLOR, J. *The Tragic Sense in Shakespeare*. Pp. 186. 18s.
- LAWRENCE, D. H. *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Pp. 318. Harmondsworth. 3s. 6d.
- LEA, K. M. *Francis Ernest Hutchinson 1871-1947*. Pp. 270-6 (Proc. Brit. Acad. XLV). 3s. 6d.
- LEWIS, C. S. *Studies in Words*. Pp. viii+240. Cambridge. 21s.
- LLOYD, R. *The Borderland. An Exploration of Theology in English Literature*. Pp. 112. 16s.
- LOCKE, F. W. *The Quest for the Holy Grail. A Literary Study of a Thirteenth-Century French Romance*. Pp. vi+126. Stanford; London. 28s.
- LONGCHAMPS, NIGEL DE. *Speculum Stultorum*, ed. J. H. Mozley and R. R. Raymo. Pp. vi+192. Berkeley. \$4.00.
- LYNEN, J. F. *The Pastoral Art of Robert Frost*. Pp. xiv+208. New Haven; London. 36s.
- MACKENZIE, N. *The Outlook for English in Central Africa*. [Inaugural lecture.] Pp. 32. 4s.
- MCNEIR, W., and LEVY, L. B. (edd.). *Studies in American Literature*. Pp. vi+178. Baton Rouge. \$3.00.
- MALONE SOCIETY. *Collections*, Vol. V. Pp. 104. Oxford.
- *The Telltale*, ed. R. A. Foakes and J. C. Gibson. Pp. xii+2 plates+120. Oxford.
- MASTERMAN, C. F. G. *The Condition of England*, ed. J. T. Boulton. Pp. xxx+252.
- MELCHIORI, G. *The Whole Mystery of Art. Pattern into Poetry in the Work of W. B. Yeats*. Pp. xiv+306. 40s.
- MELVILLE, H. *Letters*, ed. M. R. Davis and W. H. Gilman. Pp. xxxii+398. New Haven; London. 52s.
- MELMOTH, W. *Pope's Iliad. An examination*, ed. G. Cronin, Jr., and P. A. Doyle. Pp. vi+58. Washington, D.C. \$1.95.
- MERTENS-FONCK, P. *A Glossary of the Vespasian Psalter and Hymns with a Latin-Mercian Index. Part I: The Verb*. Pp. 388. Paris. O.F. 2.000.
- MIDDLE ENGLISH DICTIONARY, ed. H. Kurath and S. M. Kuhn. Parts C, 5, C. 6. Pp. 511-766. Ann Arbor. \$3 each.
- MILES, J. *Renaissance, Eighteenth-Century, and Modern Language in English Poetry. A Tabular View*. Pp. 74. Berkeley.
- MOORMAN, C. *Arthurian Triptych. Mythic Materials in Charles Williams*, C. S. Lewis, and T. S. Eliot. Pp. xii+162. Berkeley; London. 28s.
- MORGAN, C. *The Writer and his World*. Pp. vi+220. 21s.
- MUIR, K. *Shakespeare as Collaborator*. Pp. xii+164. 16s.
- MUNBY, A. N. L. *The Dispersal of the Philipps Library*. Pp. xii+204. Cambridge. 30s.
- NITCHIE, G. W. *Human Values in the Poetry of Robert Frost*. Pp. xiv+242. Durham, N.C.; London. 40s.
- OAKESHOTT, W. *The Queen and the Poet [Raleigh]*. Pp. 232. 25s.
- OLIVER, H. J. *The Art of E. M. Forster*. Pp. viii+88. Melbourne; London. 12s. 6d.
- OXFORD BOOK OF CANADIAN VERSE, ed. A. J. M. Smith. Pp. lvi+446. 40s.
- PASCAL, R. *Design and Truth in Autobiography*. Pp. x+202. 25s.
- PATRICK, J. M. *Milton's Conception of Sin as Developed in Paradise Lost*. Pp. 72. Logan, Utah.
- PAULSON, R. *Theme and Structure in Swift's Tale of a Tub*. Pp. xiv+260. New Haven; London. 36s.
- PETER, J. *A Critique of Paradise Lost*. Pp. x+172. New York; London. 25s.
- PETERS, H. F. *Rainer Maria Rilke: Masks and the Man*. Pp. xiv+226. Seattle. \$5.75.
- PETTET, E. C. *Of Paradise and Light. A Study of Vaughan's Silex Scintillans*. Pp. x+218. Cambridge. 25s.
- POLLARD, A. *English Hymns*. Pp. 64. 2s. 6d.
- PRIESTLEY, J. B. *William Hazlitt*. Pp. 40. 2s. 6d.
- QUARLES, F. *Hosanna or Divine Poems on the Passion of Christ and Threnodes*, ed. J. Horden. Pp. xxx+58. Liverpool. 10s. 6d.
- REANEY, P. H. *The Origin of English Place-Names*. Pp. x+278. 32s.
- REVISTA DE LITERATURA ARGENTINA E IBEROAMERICANA. Vol. I, No. 1. Pp. 116. Mendoza, Argentina, 1959.
- REID, M. J. C. *The Arthurian Legend. Comparison of Treatment in Modern and Mediaeval Literature*. Pp. viii+278. Edinburgh; London. [2nd edn.] 21s.
- RIBNER, I. *Patterns in Shakespearean Tragedy*. Pp. xii+206. 21s.
- RIDENOUR, G. M. *The Style of Don Juan*. Pp. xviii+168. New Haven; London. 32s.
- ROSEN, W. *Shakespeare and the Craft of Tragedy*. Pp. xiv+232. Cambridge, Mass.; London. 38s.

- ROSENFELD, S. The Theatre of the London Fairs in the Eighteenth Century. Pp. xii+194. Cambridge. 30s.
- SABOL, A. J. (ed.). Songs and Dances for the Stuart Masque. Pp. xiv+172. Providence, 1959. \$4.00.
- SANDS, D. B. (ed.). The History of Reynard the Fox translated and printed by William Caxton in 1481. Pp. x+224. Cambridge, Mass.; London. 30s.
- SCHAAR, C. An Elizabethan Sonnet Problem. Shakespeare's Sonnets, Daniel's Delia, and their Literary Background. Pp. 190. Lund; Copenhagen. Kr. 20.00.
- SCHURWEGHA, G. Present-Day English Syntax. Pp. xx+434. 21s.
- SCHÜTT, M. Das Germanenproblem in der englischen Geschichtsschreibung des 18. Jahrhunderts, and F. JUNGEMANN, Die politische Rhetorik in der englischen Renaissance. Pp. 142. Hamburg. D.M. 2.00.
- SEATON, E. Sir Richard Roos. Pp. 592. 1961. 63s.
- SEHRT, E. H. Der dramatische Auftakt in der elisabethanischen Tragödie. Pp. 214. Göttingen. D.M. 23.00.
- SEN GUPTA, S. C. Towards a Theory of the Imagination. Pp. xii+316. Oxford, 1959. 22s. 6d.
- SHAKESPEARE, W. The First Part of King Henry IV, ed. A. R. Humphreys (Arden). Pp. lxxxii+202. 21s.
- The Poems, ed. F. T. Prince (Arden). Pp. xvi+202. 21s.
- SHELLEY, P. B. Selected Poems, ed. J. Holloway. Pp. xl+152. 9s. 6d.
- SMITH, H. N., and GIBSON, W. M. (edd.). Mark Twain-Howells Letters. The Correspondence of Samuel L. Clemens and William D. Howells. Vol. I, pp. xxvi+454; Vol. II, pp. iv+455-948. Cambridge, Mass.; London. £8.
- SNUGGS, H. L. Shakespeare and Five Acts. Pp. 144. New York. \$3.50.
- SØRENSEN, K. Thomas Lodge's Translation of Seneca's *De Beneficiis* compared with Arthur Golding's Version. A Textual Analysis with Special Reference to Latinisms. Pp. 186. Copenhagen.
- SPENCER, T. J. B. The Tyranny of Shakespeare. Pp. 153-72 (Proc. Brit. Acad. XLV). 3s. 6d.
- STEWART, J. MCG. A Bibliographical Catalogue of Rudyard Kipling, ed. A. W. Yeats. Pp. xviii+674. Toronto, 1959; London. £8.
- STYAN, J. L. The Elements of Drama. Pp. viii+356. Cambridge. 25s.
- SWANN, T. B. Wonder and Whimsy. The Fantastic World of Christina Rossetti. Pp. 112. Francetown, New Hampshire. \$5.00.
- SYNGE, J. M. The Playboy of the Western World, ed. T. R. Henn. Pp. 126. 5s.
- TAYLOR, E. Poems, ed. D. E. Stanford. Pp. lxiii+544. New Haven; London. 80s.
- TENNYSON, A. Selected Poems, ed. E. Blunden. Pp. vi+162. 8s. 6d.
- THOMPSON, F. The Real Robert Louis Stevenson and Other Critical Essays, ed. T. L. Connolly, S.J. Pp. xiv+410. New York. \$2.75.
- TOLKIEN, C. (ed.). The Saga of King Heidrek the Wise. Pp. xxxviii+100+68. 35s.
- TUVESON, E. L. The Imagination as a Means of Grace. Locke and the Aesthetics of Romanticism. Pp. iv+218. Berkeley; London. 40s.
- USSHER, R. G. The Characters of Theophrastus. Pp. xiv+296. 35s.
- UTZ, H. Die Hollis-Sammlung in Bern. Ein Beitrag zu den englisch-schweizerischen Beziehungen in der Zeit der Aufklärung. Pp. 148. Bern.
- WAIN, J. Gerard Manley Hopkins: an idiom of desperation. Pp. 173-98 (Proc. Brit. Acad. XLV). 3s. 6d.
- WALPOLE, H. Correspondence with Sir Horace Mann, ed. W. S. Lewis, W. H. Smith, and G. L. Lam. Vol. IV, pp. xii+592; Vol. V, pp. viii+566; Vol. VI, pp. viii+588. New Haven; London. £18.
- WELLAND, D. S. R. Wilfred Owen. A Critical Study. Pp. 160. 12s. 6d.
- WEST, P. Byron and the Spoiler's Art. Pp. 156. 18s.
- WIEBE, H. Englisch. Eine kritische Bibliographie für Lehrende und Studierende. Pp. 136. Dortmund.
- WILLIAMSON, G. Seventeenth Century Contexts. Pp. 292. 30s.
- WILSON, F. P. Sir Walter Wilson Greg 1875-1959. Pp. 307-34 (Proc. Brit. Acad. XLV). 3s.
- WINTERS, Y. In Defense of Reason. A Study of American Experimental Poetry. Pp. viii+612. [New edn.] 42s.
- WISE, T. J. Centenary Studies, ed. W. B. Todd. Pp. 128. Austin, Texas; Edinburgh. 21s.
- WOOLF, L. Sowing. An Autobiography of the Years 1880-1904. Pp. 206. 21s.
- WRIGHT, G. T. The Poet in the Poem. The Personae of Eliot, Yeats, and Pound. Pp. xiv+168. Berkeley; London. 28s.
- WRIGHT, H. G. (ed.). A Seventeenth-Century Modernization of the First Three Books of Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*. Pp. 240. Bern. S.Fr. 38.00.





## *The Metaphysical Poets*

HELEN GARDNER

This anthology, first published in 1957 in 'The Penguin Poets', includes over two hundred poems taken from some forty authors. The texts have been edited from the original editions and there are brief annotations, biographical notes, and reading lists. 18s. net

## *A Victorian Romantic— Dante Gabriel Rossetti*

OSWALD DOUGHTY

'... the fullest and best life of the poet. . . a book of unflagging interest. From the beginning . . . to the end, in the poet's catastrophic breakdown, the material is rich, and is handled with an admirable sense of proportion. This is one of the best literary biographies.' Frank Kermode in the *Spectator*. Illustrated. Second edition. 50s. net

## *Ben Jonson and the Language of Prose Comedy*

JONAS A. BARISH

This is an examination of every aspect of Jonson's prose, including such elements as a study of the antecedents of common prose, and of realism in English literature in the late sixteenth century, together with the whole language of Jonson's theatre, verse, and prose. *Harvard University Press* 40s. net

## *Byron, Shelley, Hunt and The Liberal*

WILLIAM H. MARSHALL

The 'unholy alliance' of Byron, Shelley, and Hunt in 1822-3 to establish and publish *The Liberal* is examined in all its aspects. Although attention is centred on Byron, the author points to significant literary contributions made by *The Liberal* and documents the public *furor* caused by this short-lived magazine. *University of Pennsylvania Press* 40s. net

## *Annals of English Literature 1475-1950*

The Principal Publications of each Year together with an Alphabetical List of Authors with their Works. Second edition 25s. net

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

